Ex

*Edward Clark Porter.*

SEVERAL

# CONFERENCES

Between a

# Romish Priest,

A

# Fanatick-Chaplain,

AND A

# DIVINE

OF THE

# *Church* of *England*,

CONCERNING THE

# IDOLATRY

OF THE

# CHURCH of *ROME*:

Being a Full ANSWER to the Late DIALOGUES of *T. G.*

---

The Sixth Volume.

---

By the Right Reverend Father in God
*Edward Stillingfleet*, D. D. Late Lord Bishop of *Worcester*.

---

*LONDON*: Printed for *Henry* and *George Mortlock*, at the *Phœnix* in St. *Paul's* Church-yard. MDCCX.

THE

# PREFACE.

THE *following* Diſcourſes *contain a full and Diſtinct Anſwer to the late* Dialogues *of* T. G. *wherein the Reader may perceive what an eaſy Victory, Truth, when it ſtands its Ground, will obtain over Wit and Subtilty. When the Man who fell in the* Olympick Games *endeavoured by his Eloquence to perſuade the Spectators he was never down, it is poſſible he might meet with ſome weak, and others partial enough to believe him; but the Judges could not but ſmile at their folly who did not diſcern the difference between the firmneſs of the ones ſtanding and the others artificial riſing; the one might ſhew more art and dexterity, but the other had more ſtrength, or ſome other advantage. I ſhall leave the Reader to judge in theſe Combats who maintains his Ground beſt, and who ſeeks chiefly to avoid the diſreputation of loſing it. He that keeps cloſe to his Adverſary, declines no difficulty, uſes no reproachful language, or diſingenuous dealing, hath certainly greater aſſurance of the Goodneſs of his Cauſe, and more Hopes to prevail, than he that ſtudies for Shifts and Evaſions, avoids the ſtrongeſt Arguments, and flies out into Impertinent Cavils, and Perſonal Reflections; which are great Signs that the Man is conſcious of the Badneſs of his Cauſe, and deſpairs of Succeſs by any other Means. And the Author of theſe Diſcourſes deſires that his Adverſary and himſelf may ſtand or fall according to theſe Meaſures.*

*As to the manner of Writing here uſed,* viz. *by way of* Dialogue, *it is that which his Adverſary led him to; and poſſibly, where the Decency of it is well obſerved, it may make Controverſy go down more pleaſantly than otherwiſe it would. For there appears more Life and Vigor in a Diſcourſe carried on by ſeveral Perſons of different Humours and Opinions, than in one continued deduction of Reaſon. And the Author declares he intended no Reflection on any Sober Party of Men among us in the Repreſentation made of the* Army-Chaplain, *who bears the Third Part in the* Conferences; *but only to ſhew the Ad-*

*vantage the* Popish *Party takes from the Weak and Peevish Exceptions which some Men have made against the* Church *of* England, *and how they insinuate themselves into them on the account of their Prejudices against it, and have made use of their Indiscreet Zeal to compass their own Ends.*

*Which is so far from being a* Romance *or* Fiction, *that besides the Footsteps which may be yet traced of these Transactions, by the Means and Instruments which were employ'd about them; we find that one of the most Busy Factors of the* Roman-Church, *when he most confidently deny'd the other Parts of the late Horrid Design, did not stick to avow and own this, That they did hope to prevail at last by joining their Strength with the Obstinate Dissenters, in procuring a General Toleration; which was all the Visible Design they were carrying on when these Discourses were written: Since which the face of Things have been so much alter'd among us, and the Times appear'd so busy and dangerous, that it was thought more advisable to respite the Publishing of these Controversial Discourses till Mens Minds were a little calmed, lest the Author of them should seem guilty of the Impertinent Diligence of* Archimedes, *viz. of drawing Lines in the Dust, when the Enemy was ready to destroy us.*

*Had the Author had any Occasion to have run away from the Argument under debate between him and his Adversary, he did not want a Fair Opportunity in the present State of Things, to have put him in mind of something very different from an* Irenicum. *But he desired me to acquaint the* Reader *that he does so perfectly abhor this Impertinent and Disingenuous Way of Writing, especially about Matters of Religion, that he could neither be provok'd nor tempted to it, no not by so great and fresh an Example as he had all along before his Eyes.*

May that Wise and Gracious God, who hath hitherto defeated the Cruel and Malicious Designs of our Church's Enemies, still preserve it under *the Shadow of his Wings*, and continue it *a Praise in the Earth.*

THE

# First Conference,

## *Concerning the Sense of the* Church *of* England, *about the Idolatry of the* Church *of* Rome.

*Rom. P.* YOU are well met at this Auction of Books; I have been present at many of them beyond Sea; but I never was at one in *England* before. How go the Prices of Books here?

*Fan. Ch.* Very dear methinks, by the Books I have bought; but I find they are so catched up by our Brethren, that if we will have them, we must pay dear for them.

*R. P.* May I know what they are, Sir?

*F. C.* Only some few choice Pieces which I have picked out of this great Catalogue; such as, Nepthali *or the Groanings of the Church of* Scotland; Cooks *Monarchy no Creature of God's making*; but the things I most value are the *Pamphlets*, such as *Sermons before the Long Parliament* in several Volumes. And a rare *Collection* of *Authors about Liberty of Conscience.*

*R. P.* Are there so many Books to be had about *Liberty of Conscience?*

*F. C.* Yes; a great many have written for and against it.

*R. P.* Who are they who have written for it?

*F. C.* To tell you the truth, some of the same who wrote against it heretofore; but they are now more enlightned; as those who wrote against Separation when time was, are now the greatest Advocates for it. For, there are some providential Truths, which vary according to Circumstances. Do not we see the Papists, who were thought the greatest Enemies to Toleration in the World, now plead most vehemently for it? and are even angry with us for not acting sufficiently in this Cause against the *Church* of *England.* But because I take you for a Friend by your enquiring after these Books, I must tell you, it is yet a disputable Point among us, how far we may joyn with *Antichrist*, to promote the Interest of *Christ*: And some insist on that Place to prove the Unlawfulness of it, *Be ye not unequally yoked*; others again prove it lawful, because it is said, *Yet not altogether with the Fornicators of this World——or with Idolaters*: Whence they observe, that they may joyn with them in some Things, or for some Ends; but *not altogether*, *i. e.* they must not joyn with them in their *Idolatries*, but they may against the *Church* of *England.*

*R. P.* This is too publick a Place to talk of these Matters in; but may we not withdraw into the next Room; for I have a great Mind to set you right in this main Point of present Concernment. And if the *Papists* should be found not to be *Idolaters*, a great Part of your Difficulty is gone. Do you think, it is not fit for you to be better informed in this Matter, when a Thing of so great Consequence depends upon it, as your Deliverance from the Persecution of the *Church* of *England*?

which you know, we have all ſighed and groaned for, a long time. It is in vain for any of you to expect Favour from thence, as long as ſhe is able to ſtand. For if the *Biſhops* were never ſo much inclined to it, how could they poſſibly give eaſe to you without deſtroying themſelves? And ſince the diſſenting Parties are ſo different among themſelves in their Light and Attainments, it is impoſſible to pleaſe any one Party, without diſpleaſing all the reſt. *Comprehenſion* is a mere Snare and Temptation to the Brethren, being a Deſign to prefer ſome, and to leave the reſt in the Lurch. Let us all joyn our Strengths together, to pull down this *Church* of *England*, and then, though there be *a King in* Iſrael, *every one may do what ſeemeth good in his own Eyes.*

*F. C.* I doubt you are not well ſeen in Scripture; for the Text is, *In thoſe Days there was no King in Iſrael, and every one did what ſeemed good in his own Eyes:* Whence you may obſerve a ſpecial Hint by the by, that *Toleration* agrees beſt with a *Common-wealth.* But this to your ſelf: and you might juſtly wonder at this Freedom with you; but that I remember you many Years ago, when you and I preached up the Fifth Monarchy together in the Army. Thoſe were glorious Days! Ah the Liberty we then enjoyed! Did we then think, the good Old Cauſe would ever have ended thus? Well! It is good to be ſilent in bad Times. But methinks you and I however may retire and talk over Old Stories, and refreſh our Memories with former Out-goings together. For here is little at preſent for us to do.

*R. P.* Whereabouts are they now in the Catalogue?

*F. C.* Among the *Fathers*; thoſe *Old-Teſtament Divines.* What Lights have we ſeen ſince their Days! We need not trouble our ſelves about them. But I obſerve the *Church* of *England* Men buy them up at any Rate. What Prices do they give for a *Juſtin Martyr*, or *Epiphanius* or *Philo*, who they ſay was a mere *Jew*? How muſt they ſtarve their People with the *Divinity* of theſe Men? How much of the good *Divinity* of the late Times might they have for the Money? We cannot but pity their Blindneſs. But I ſee we cannot be here ſo private as we wiſhed; for yonder ſits a *Divine* of the *Church* of *England*, who I ſuppoſe, is the Perſon who bought ſo many *Fathers* at the laſt *Auction*, as though he had a Mind to write againſt the *Papiſts.*

*R. P.* Sit you by a while; and we will talk of our Matters another time. I have been much abroad ſince you and I were firſt acquainted, and have lately brought over a new Book from *Paris.* You ſhall ſee how I will handle him; and if you will put in upon Occaſion, you ſhall find by this Experiment, what Succeſs our united Forces would have againſt the *Church* of *England.*

*F. C.* Do you begin; and you ſhall ſee how I will ſecond you, when Occaſion offers it ſelf.

*R. P.* Sir, I perceive the *Divines* of the *Church* of *England*, do buy up the *Fathers* very much at *Auctions.* I wonder that any who read the *Fathers* can be for the *Church* of *England.*

*Pr. Div.* And I do more wonder at you for ſaying ſo. For therefore we are for the *Church* of *England*, becauſe we read both *Scripture* and *Fathers.*

*R. P.* To what Purpoſe is all this Charge and Pains, if there be *an* Infallible *Church*?

*P. D.* Therefore to good Purpoſe; becauſe there is no *one Church* infallible.

*R. P.*

*R. P.* Is there not a *Catholick Church?*

*P. D.* Do you think I have forgotten my Creed?

*R. P.* Which is that *Catholick Church?*

*P. D.* Which of all the Parts is the Whole? Is that your wiſe Queſtion? Do not you know the Chriſtian Church hath been broken into different Communions ever ſince the Four General Councils, and continues ſo to this Day? What do you mean by the *Catholick Church?*

*R. P.* I mean the *Church* of *Rome.*

*P. D.* Then you ask me, which is the *Church* of *Rome?* But what need you ask that, ſince you know it already?

*R. P.* But the *Roman Church* is the *Catholick Church.*

*P. D.* You may as well ſay, *London* is *England*, or *England* the *World.* And why may not we call *England* the World, becauſe the reſt of the World is *divided* from it; as you the *Roman Church* the *Catholick Church*, becauſe the other *Churches* are ſeperated in Communion from it?

*R. P.* I mean the *Roman Church* is the *Head* and *Fountain* of *Catholick Doctrine*; and other Churches are pure and ſound, as they do agree with it.

*P. D.* Your Propoſition is not ſo ſelf-evident, that the bare knowing your meaning, muſt make me aſſent. I pray firſt prove what you ſay, before I yield.

*R. P.* Was not the *Church* of *Rome* once a Sound and *Catholick Church?*

*P. D.* What then? ſo was the *Church* of *Jeruſalem*, of *Antioch* and *Alexandria*; and ſo were the Seven *Churches* of *Aſia.* Were all theſe *Heads* and *Fountains* too?

*R. P.* But S. *Paul* ſpeaks of the *Church* of *Rome.*

*P. D.* He doth ſo; but not much to her Comfort; for he ſuppoſes *ſhe may be broken off through Unbelief*, as well as any other *Church.*

*R. P.* Doth not S. *Paul* ſay, *that the Roman Faith was ſpoken of throughout the World?*

*P. D.* What then I beſeech you? Doth it follow that Faith muſt always continue the ſame any more than that the *Church* of *Philadelphia* muſt at this Day be, what it was when S. *John* wrote thoſe great Commendations of it? Theſe are ſuch ſlender Proofs that you had as good come to downright begging the Cauſe, as pretend to maintain it after ſuch a manner. The *Faith* of *Rome* was not more ſpoken of in the *Apoſtles* Days, than its Errors and Corruptions have been ſince.

*R. P.* Theſe are general Words; name me one of thoſe Errors and Corruptions.

*P. D.* For this time, I will name the publick and allowed *Worſhip* of your *Church*, which after all your Shifts and Evaſions I cannot excuſe from *Idolatry.*

*R. P.* How is that? *Idolatry?* God forbid. I did not expect this Charge from a *Divine* of the *Church* of *England.* I was prepared to receive it from my old *Fanatick Acquaintance* here; he would have thundered me with the *Texts* of *Antichriſt*, and the *Whore* of *Babylon*, and have quoted half the *Book* of the *Revelations* againſt me, before this time, if we had not eſpyed you in the Room. But I perceive though your Artillery may be different, your Charge is the ſame. I pray tell me how long is it ſince you of the *Church* of *England* have maintained this Charge? For I have been often told, that only one late *Defender* of your *Church*, hath advanced Two new Charges againſt

the *Church* of *Rome*, viz. *Fanaticiſm* and *Idolatry*, and that the *true Sons* of the *Church* of *England* diſown them both.

*P. D.* Whoever told you ſo hath deceived you; but it is not the only thing they have deceived you in. I never yet ſaw ſo much as a tolerable Anſwer to the Charge of *Fanaticiſm*. And for that of *Idolatry*, the Author you mean, hath proved beyond Contradiction, *that it hath been managed againſt the Church of* Rome, *by the greateſt and moſt learned Defenders of the Church of* England, *and the moſt genuine Sons of it, ever ſince the Reformation.*

*R. P.* But have not you ſeen what *T. G.* hath ſaid to all that, and how he hath ſhewed *that his Witneſſes were incompetent*?

*P. D.* I have both ſeen and conſider'd all that *T. G.* hath ſaid, and compared it with Dr. *Stillingfleet*'s Reply in the *General Preface* to his *Anſwers*. And I muſt declare to you, that if the Senſe of a Church may be known by the concurrent Senſe of her moſt eminent *Divines*, or by her moſt *Authentick Acts*, as by the *Book* of *Homilies*, *Forms* of *Prayer* and *Thankſgivings*, *Rubricks*, *Injunctions*, the *Judgment* of *Convocation*, even that of MDCXL, Dr. *St.* hath made it evident, that the Charge of *Idolatry* is agreeable to the *Senſe* of the *Church* of *England*.

*R. P.* You thought *T. G.* would have quitted this Poſt upon Dr. *St*'s ſecond Charge; but you are miſtaken in him; for I have brought over a *Book* of *Dialogues* from *Paris*, wherein *T. G.* undertakes again to prove this to be only the *Charge* of *Fanaticks*, and not of the *Church* of *England*, nor of the *Genuine Sons* of it.

*F. C.* It is true; we whom you call *Fanaticks* do charge the *Church* of *Rome*, or rather the *Synagogue* of *Antichriſt*, with *Idolatry*; for, Is it not ſaid, *And they Worſhipped the Beaſt*? But you muſt know for your comfort, that we do likewiſe charge the *Church* of *England* with it. For what are all their Bowings, and Kneelings, and Croſſings, but vain Imaginations? and the Worſhip of them is as bad as the Worſhip of Images. And do not they make an *Idol* of the *Common Prayer*?

*P. D.* This is not fair, Gentlemen; but one at once I beſeech you. As to your Charge of the *Church* of *England*, I ſhall be ready to anſwer it, when you can agree to bring it in. I now deſire to know, what Evidence *T. G.* brings to prove the Charge of Idolatry not to be agreeable to the Senſe of the *Church* of *England*. Hath he brought other *Homilies*, other *Injunctions*, other *Rubricks*, other *Convocations*, or at leaſt other *Divines*, generally received and owned for the *Genuine Sons* of this *Church*, who have from time to time freed the *Church* of *Rome* from *Idolatry*, and looked upon the Charge, not only as unjuſt but pernicious and deſtructive to the Being of a Church? Nay, can he produce any one *Divine* of the *Church* of *England*, before the *Convocation* MDCXL, that ever ſaid any ſuch thing, or did wholly acquit the Church of *Rome* from this Charge? If not, let him not think we have a new Church made after another Model, and upon new Principles, or that thoſe can be eſteemed the genuine Sons of it, who contradict the Senſe of the Church ever ſince the Reformation. If there be any ſuch among us, they ought firſt to be proved to be true Sons of our Church, before their Teſtimony be allowed; which if I be not miſtaken, will be much harder, than to prove the Charge of Idolatry to be agreeable to the Senſe of it. But what Method doth *T. G.* take in this Matter?

*R. P.*

*R. P. T. G.* like a wary Man disputes in *Masquerade*. For he doth not think fit to appear in his own Person; but he brings in a *Conformist* and a *Non-conformist* arguing the Point. And the *Conformist* speaks *T. G*'s Sense in acquitting the *Church* of *Rome*; and the *Non-conformist* vindicates Dr. *St.* and makes a pitiful Defence of him.

*P. D.* It was very wittily done. And the *Scene* was well enough laid, if the Plot were only to represent Dr. *St.* as a secret Enemy to the *Church* of *England*, as I suppose it was. But to what purpose are all those Personal Reflections: And some repeated over and over, with so much Appearance of Rancor and Ill Will, as doth not become a Man of any common Ingenuity? Can the *Catholick Cause* be maintained by no other Arts than these? Methinks *T. G.* might have let the little *Whifflers* in Controversy, such as the *Author* of the *Address to the Parliament*, and of that precious Pamphlet called *Jupiter*, *Dr. St's Supreme God*, &c. to have made a Noise at they know not what; crying out upon him *as an Enemy to the Church of* England, (because he defends her Cause to their great Vexation) and *as a Friend to Pagan Idolatry*, (because he hath laid open the Folly of yours.) These are such weak Assaults as expose your Cause to the Contempt of all wise Men; who expect Reason should be answered with Reason, and not with Calumnies and Reproaches: Which in my Apprehension Dr. *St.* ought to rejoice in as the Marks of Victory; for while they have any other Ammunition left, no Enemies will betake themselves to Dirt and Stones. When I read through the *First Part* of *T. G*'s *Dialogues*, and observed how industriously he set himself to bespatter his Adversary, and raked all the Kennels he could for that Purpose, (especially that of the *Patronus bonæ fidei*, &c.) I could not but think of an Animal, which being closely pursued and in great Danger, gets himself into the most convenient Place for Mire and Dirt, and there so lays about him with his Heels, that no one dares to come near him. It was certainly with some such Design that *T. G.* hath at last taken Sanctuary in a Bog; hoping his Adversary will never pursue him thither. But notwithstanding this Project of his, we will try, whether in spite of his Heels we cannot bring him to Reason. Therefore I pray let us set aside all rude and unbecoming Reflections, and calmly consider, how *T. G.* proves that the *Charge* of *Idolatry* is not agreeable to the Sense of the *Church* of *England*.

*R. P.* Hold Sir; You are a little too nimble, *T. G.* saith, *his Intention was only to shew, that Dr.* St. *had not sufficiently proved it to be the Sense of the Church of* England, *from the Testimony he then produced, whatsoever he might or could do from other Acts or Authors of that Church.* And he elsewhere saith, *that* T. G. *did not dispute* ex professo, *whether it were the Sense of the Church of* England, *that the Church of* Rome *is guilty of Idolatry or no? Nor, whether Dr.* St. *dissented from the Sense of his Church? but what he undertook to shew was no more than that two parts of the Authors there cited by the Dr. were Puritans, or Puritanically inclin'd, by the Confession of other Divines of the Church of* England; *and therefore according to Dr.* St's *own Measures (if they were good,) their Testimonies ought to be looked on as incompetent to prove what he asserted; and for the other Six, that what they charged with Idolatry, was not the Doctrine of the Church of* Rome, *but some things which they conceived to be great Abuses in the Practice of it. And this*, he saith, *is the true State of that Controversy.* *Dial p. 13.* *Pag. 19.*

*P. D.* If it be so, I cry *T. G.* Mercy. For, I thought he designed to prove this Charge of *Idolatry* not to be agreeable to the *Sense* of the *Church*

*Church* of *England.* But you ſay *T. G.* now denies it ; and if I were as Dr. *St.* I would thank him for it. For, would any Man ſay this, that thought it could ever be proved to be againſt the Senſe of the *Church* of *England* ? And what could have been more material to his Purpoſe than this, if it could have been done ? Well fare *T. G*'s Ingenuity for once! that finding it impoſſible to be done,he now denies that he ever attempted the doing it. But the firſt Queſtion in a Fray is, *how fell they out* ? we ſhall better judge of *T. G*'s Deſign by the Occaſion of it. Dr. *St.* affirmed that in the Charge of *Idolatry* he did not contradict the Senſe of the *Church* of *England.* Did he, or did he not ? If he did not, Dr. *St.* was in the right : If he did, why did not *T. G.* ſhew it ? But after this yielding up the main Point in Effect, it is eaſy to prove that *T. G.* did deſign to ſhew, as well as he could, that the Charge of *Idolatry* was againſt the *Senſe* of the *Church* of *England* ; but finding it would not do, he now diſowns it. For (1.) Doth not *T. G.* appeal to the *Articles* of the *Church* of *England* for the moſt Authentick Declaration of her Senſe? and becauſe the *Church* of *Rome* is not there charged with *Idolatry*, doth he not hence diſpute *ex Profeſſo*, that it was againſt her *Senſe* ? To what Purpoſe was that ingeniousCriticiſm,of being rather *repugnant to theWord of God* ; which he interprets as tho' the Compoſers of our Articles *had done their Endeavour to find a Command againſt the Worſhip of Images, but could not.* What do you think of this Argument ? what did *T. G.* intend to prove by it ? Is it not as clear as the Sun, that it was to ſhew that the Charge of *Idolatry* was againſt the Senſe of the *Church* of *England* ? Why then is *T. G.* aſhamed now of it, and denies he had any ſuch Deſign ? There muſt be ſome more than ordinary Cauſe of a Man's denying what he once ſo openly avowed to do. Nay, in theſe very *Dialogues*, after repeating his former words, *T. G.* ſaith, *Thus clearly hath* T. G. *evinced the Senſe of the Church of* England *in this matter.* Say you ſo ? and yet never deſigned to diſpute *ex Profeſſo*, whether it were the *Senſe* of the *Church* of *England* or not ? Who is it, I pray, hath the Knack of *ſaying*, and *unſaying* ; of affirming and denying the very ſame thing in a few Leaves ? or did *T. G.* never intend any ſuch thing ; but the *Church* of *England* of her own accord, knowing *T. G*'s good Affections to her, ſtept into the *Court*, and declared her Senſe ? Have we not the beſt natured *Church* in the World that is ſo kind to her Enemies, and expreſſeth her Senſe to be on their ſide, whether they will or not ? Our Church then is like the Countryman's River which comes without calling; alas ! what need *T. G. diſpute ex Profeſſo*, what her Senſe is ; ſhe offers her own Teſtimony, and deſires to be heard in the *Diſpute* whether *T. G.* will or not. Let any man judge by theſe Words what *T. G*'s Deſign was then, whatever he thinks fit to own now. (2.) He ſhews, *That if it had been the Senſe of the Church of* England *in the Articles, that the Church of* Rome *were guilty of Idolatry in the Worſhip of Images, Adoration of the Hoſt, or Invocation of Saints, all thoſe who denied it, would have incurred Excommunication* ipſo facto, *as appears by the Canons.* What was *T. G*'s Deſign in this, if it were not to prove the Charge of *Idolatry* to be againſt the Senſe of the *Church* of *England* ? Is this *only to ſhew the Witneſſes Dr.* St. *produced to be incompetent* ? What a Benefit it is, for a Man to forget what he hath no mind to remember ! And then to deny as ſtoutly as if the thing had never been done. (3.) Is it not *T. G.* who in Terms aſſerts, *That Dr.* St. *betrayed his Church in advancing ſuch a Medium, as contradicts the Senſe of that Church,* ( mark that. ) *It is true,*

*Cath. no Idol. p. 197.*

*Dial. p. 62.*

Preface to *Cath. no Idol.*

*true*, he adds, *if it be to be taken from the Sentiments of those who are esteemed her true and genuine Sons.* Was it *T. G*'s Design then, *not to dispute what was the Sense of the Church of* England; *nor whether Dr.* St. *dissented from it?* I will not meddle with that, whether *T. G.* be a competent Judge *who are the true and genuine Sons of the Church of* England. No doubt, in his Opinion, those who come neareſt the Church of *Rome* are such; and advance such Speculations as lay the Charge of Schism at her own Door. But *true Sons* are no more for laying *Division* to the Charge of their *Mother*, than the *true Mother* was for *dividing* the *Son.* Those are certainly the most *genuine Sons* of our *Church*, who own her Doctrine, defend her Principles, conform to her Rules, and are most ready to maintain her *Cause* against all her Enemies. And among these there is no *difference*, and there ought to be no *distinction.* But if in any frame a *Church* of their own *Heads*, without any regard to the *Articles*, *Homilies*, and current *Doctrine* of our *Church*, and yet will call that the *Church* of *England*, and themselves *the only genuine Sons* of it, I do not question *T. G.* and your Brethren would be glad to have them thought so, to lessen our Number and impair our Interest; but none that understand and value our *Church*, will endure such a pernicious Discrimination among the *Sons* of the same *Mother*; as though some few were fatally determined to be the *Sons* of *our Church*, whatever their *Works* and *Merits* were; and others absolutely *cast off*, notwithstanding the greatest *Service.* I should not mention this, but that I see *T. G.* insinuating all along such a Distinction as this; and crying up some Persons on purpose as *the only genuine Sons of the Church of* England, that he might cast Reproach upon others; and thereby foment Animosities among *Brethren.* But whose *Children* those are who do so, I leave *T. G.* to consider.

*R. P.* Whatever *T. G.*'s Intention was, yet you cannot deny *that he hath proved Two parts in Three to be incompetent Witnesses, according to his own Measures.*

*P. D.* Not deny it? I never saw any thing more weakly attempted to be proved, as Dr. *St.* hath shewed at large in his Preface. Bishop *White* being rejected as a *Puritan*, because condemned by that Party. Bishop *Jewel*, because King *Charles* said he was not infallible. Bishop *Bilson*, because of his Errors about Civil Government, though a stout Defender of the *Church* of *England.* Bishop *Davenant*, because he was none of the *Fathers.* Bishop *Usher*, because his *Adversary* gives an ill Character of him. By this you may judge, what powerful *Exceptions T. G.* made against *Two parts in Three of the Witnesses.*

*R. P. T. G.* saith, *That Dr.* St. *rather waved the Exceptions by pretty facetious Artifices of Wit, than repelled them by a downright Denial, out of the Affection* Catharinus *hopes he bears still to the Cause, which had been honoured by such Learned and Godly Bishops as* Jewel, Downham, Usher, *the two* Abbots *and* Davenant: *Which are recorded among the* Puritans *by the* Patronus bonæ fidei. *Dial. p. 9.*

*P. D.* You might as well have quoted *Surius & Cochlæus* for your Church; as this *Patronus bonæ fidei* for ours. For he is an Historian much of their Size and Credit. But of him we shall have occasion to speak hereafter: *T. G.* filling Page after Page out of him. Let the Reader judge whether Dr. *St.* did not shew *T. G.*'s Exceptions to be vain and frivolous, and consequently these remain Substantial and Competent *Witnesses.* And as to the *Cause* of the *Church* of *England*, which these learned

learned and pious Prelates *defended* and *honoured*, Dr. *St.* will rejoice to be joined with them, though it be in ſuffering Reproach for the ſake of it.

*R. P.* Let us paſs over theſe ſingle *Teſtimonies*, and come to the moſt
*Dial. p. 14.* material Proofs which D. *St.* uſed, and *T. G.* declares, *he is not yet convinced by them; that the Charge of Idolatry was the Senſe of the Church of* England.

*P. D.* With all my heart. The *Firſt* was from the *Book of Homiles*, not barely allowed, but ſubſcribed to, as containing godly and wholſome Doctrine very neceſſary for theſe times; which owns this Charge of Idolatry not in any doubtful, or ſingle Paſſage, but in an elaborate Diſcourſe intended for the Teachers, as well as the People. To which he added, that the Doctrine of the Homilies is allowed in the Thirty nine Articles; which were approved by the Queen; confirmed by the Subſcription of both *Houſes* of *Convocation*, A.D. 1571. And therefore he deſires *T. G.* to reſolve him, whether Men of any common Underſtanding would have ſubſcribed to the *Book* of *Homilies* in this manner, if they had believed the main Doctrine and Deſign of one of them had been falſe and pernicious? If, ſaith he, any of the Biſhops had at that time thought the Charge of Idolatry unjuſt, and that it had ſubverted the Foundation of Eccleſiaſtical Authority, would they have inſerted this into the Articles, when it was in their Power to have left it out? And that the Homilies contained a wholeſome and godly Doctrine, which in their Conſciences they believed to be falſe and pernicious? He might as well think, he ſaith, that the *Council* of *Trent* would have allowed *Calvin's Inſtitutions, as containing a wholeſome and godly Doctrine*, as that Men ſo perſuaded would have allowed the *Homily againſt the peril of Idolatry*. And how is it poſſible to underſtand the Senſe of our Church better, than by ſuch Publick and Authentick Acts of it, which all Perſons, who are in any Place of Truſt in the Church, muſt ſubſcribe and declare their Approbation of? This Homily hath ſtill continued the ſame, the Articles the very ſame, and if ſo, they muſt acknowledge this hath been and is to this Day the Senſe of our Church. And to what *T. G.* ſaith, *that this doth not evince every particular Doctrine contained in the Homilies to be godly and wholeſome, becauſe the whole Book is ſubſcribed to as containing ſuch Doctrine*; he anſwers, that there is a great deal of Difference to be made between ſome particular Paſſages and Expreſſions in theſe Homilies, and the main Doctrine and Deſign of a whole Homily: And between ſubſcribing to a whole Book as containing godly and wholſome Doctrine, though Men be not ſo certain of the Truth of every Paſſage in it; and if they are convinced that any Doctrine contained in it is falſe and pernicious. Now thoſe who deny the Church of *Rome* to be guilty of Idolatry do not only look on the Charge as falſe, but as of dangerous Conſequence; and therefore ſuch a Subſcription would be ſhuffling and diſhoneſt. From theſe things laid together, in my mind Dr. *St.* hath not only clearly proved that the Charge of *Idolatry* was not only owned by the Compoſers of the *Homilies*, but by all who have honeſtly ſubſcribed to the *Articles* from that time to our own. And I would be glad to hear what Anſwer *T. G.* gives to all this.

*Dial. p. 15.* *R. P.* He anſwers, firſt by repeating what he ſaid before; and then by ſhewing *that Subſcription is no good Argument, conſidering what had*

*been*

*been done and undone in that kind in the Reigns of K.* Henry VIII. Edward VI. *Q.* Mary, *and Q.* Elizabeth, *not to ſpeak of latter Times.*

*P. D.* What is this, but in plain Terms to ſay the Subſcribers of our *Articles* were Men of no Honeſty or Conſcience; but would ſay or unſay, ſubſcribe one thing or another as it ſerved their turn? If this be his way of defending our Church, we ſhall deſire him to defend his own. But yet, this doth not reach home to the *Doctor's* Argument, which proceeded not merely on their Honeſty, but their having common Underſtanding. For here was no Force or Violence offered them, they had the full Power to conſider the *Articles*, and to compoſe the *Homilies*; and would Men of common Senſe put in things againſt their own Minds, and make, and approve, and recommend Homilies which they did not believe themſelves? This evidently proves the Compoſers of the *Homilies*, and *Convocation* at that time, did approve the Doctrine of theſe *Homilies*, for it was in their Power not to have paſſed them. Thus far it is plain *that* was the Doctrine of the Church then; and why ſhould we ſuppoſe any Subſcribers to take them in any other Senſe, than the Church did then mean them? Nay, Dr. *St.* challenged him, to produce any one Divine of our Church, who through the long Reign of *Q. Elizabeth* did ſo much as once queſtion the Truth of this Charge. Doth *T. G.* upon ſo long Conſideration of this Matter, name any?

*R. P.* Not any that I find.

*P. D.* But that will be beſt ſeen by conſidering Dr. *St.*'s Second Argument of the Senſe of the *Church* of *England* in this matter, *viz.* from the *current* Doctrine of the *Church* ever ſince the *Reformation*; the *Injunctions of* Edward VI. of *Cranmer*, of *Q. Elizabeth*; the *Form* of *Thankſgiving*, A. D. 1594.

*R. P.* To this *T. G.* anſwers, *That this was a Heat in the Beginning of the Reformation; but after the Crown was ſettled upon K.* James, *whoſe Title was unqueſtionable both at* Rome, (*at Home* I ſuppoſe he means) *and abroad, the dangerous Conſequences of the Charge of Idolatry, began to be more calmly and maturely conſidered; and were ſo throughly weighed in the time of K.* Charles I. *that as* Heylin *ſaith, Biſhop* Laud *hindred the reprinting the Books containing* Calvinian *Doctrines. Which evidently ſhews,* ſaith he, *That that Party never looked upon the Expreſſions of Idolatry contained in thoſe Injunctions, as the Dogmatical Senſe of the Church of* England. *Dial. p.* 17.

*P. D.* A very likely Story! that our Church ſhould vary in its Doctrine, *becauſe K.* James *his Title to the Crown was unqueſtionable.* It ſeems before, the *Church* of *Rome* was guilty of Idolatry, becauſe *Q. Elizabeth*'s Title was not owned by the *Pope.* What a fine Inſinuation is couched under all this? *Viz.* That our *Church* depended wholy on the *Queen's* Pleaſure, and fitted Her Doctrines to ſerve Her Turn; and when that was over, the Tide turned, and that was pernicious Doctrine now, which was wholſome before; and wholſome now, which was pernicious before: And yet there were the ſame *Articles*, the ſame *Homilies*, the ſame *Subſcriptions* which were before.

*R. P.* But he quotes a *Doctor* of your own *Church* for what he ſaith, *P. Heylin*, and delivers it in his Words.

*P. D. P. Heylin* ſpeaks not one Word in that Place of the *Charge* of *Idolatry*; (although *T. G.* ſeems to repreſent it ſo) *but of thoſe who reviled the Church of* Rome *it ſelf, and all the Divine Offices, Ceremonies, and Performances of it.* Which it is plain, he there ſpeaks of the *Gene-* *Cypr. Anglic. p.* 364. 1 *Ed.*

vian Party; for but just before he mentions *the Geneva Bible*, and *the dangerous Positions contained in the Annotations printed with it.* Now these Persons, whom he there speaks of, looked upon the *Church* of *Rome* as a *mere Synagogue of Satan, and no true Church*; and all the Offices and Ceremonies of it to be so defiled, that *no Use* could be made of them; and on that Account they rejected our *Liturgy* and *Ceremonies*, as taken from the *Church* of *Rome*. *Although therefore*, saith he, *Q.* Elizabeth *might suffer such things to be printed in her time*; *yet B.* Laud *would not allow the reprinting of them*; because *Q. Elizabeth* might out of State Policy suffer the violent Transports of irregular Zeal, by reason of her personal Quarrels with the Pope; yet now those Reasons being over, B. *Laud* would not suffer them to come abroad again. But that this Expression cannot be understood of the Charge of *Idolatry*, I prove by these Arguments. (1.) *P. Heylin* himself preaching before K. *Charles* I. and *Archbishop Laud*, did in plain Terms charge the Worship of Images with most *gross Idolatry*, as appears by the Words cited at large in Dr. *St.*'s general Preface. What saith *T. G.* to this?

*R. P.* I do not find a particular Answer to this; but I suppose he reckons him with those Six of whom he saith, *That they do not charge the*
P. 34. *Church of* Rome *it self, but the Opinions of School Divines and Abuses in Practice.*

*P. D.* That cannot be, for *P. Heylin* goes farther; saying, *That they, who observe the manner of their Worship of Images, with what Pilgrimages, Processions, Offerings, with what Affectaions, Prayers, and humble Bendings of the Body they have been, and are worshipped in the Church of* Rome, *might very easily conceive, that she was once again relapsed into her ancient Paganism.*

*R. P.* He saith, *They might conceive so*; but he doth not say, they might *justly* conceive so.

*P. D.* This is very subtle, and like *T. G.* himself. But I pray observe, *P. Heylin*, when he gives an Account of the *Worship* of *Images*, saith, *When the Doctrine, which first began in the Schools, came to its Growth, what Fruits could it bear, but most gross Idolatry, greater than which, was never known among the Gentiles?* Mark that for your Satisfaction. What *Fruit could the Doctrine bear*, and that after *it came out of the Schools to its Growth.* And when he saith, *They might conceive that* Rome *was once again relapsed into her ancient Paganism*: The meaning is, Those that saw their Worship of Images in modern *Rome*, and compared it with what was done in old *Rome*, would see no Difference; the Idolatry was so gross in both, that if there were nothing else to make a Distinction, a Man might easily conceive *Rome* was relapsed into her *Ancient Paganism.*

*R. P.* But what other Argument have you to prove that *P. Heylin* could not speak this of the Charge of *Idolatry*?

*P. D.* Because in his *Introduction* he owns the Doctrine of the *Homilies*
Necessary Introd. to the History of B. *Laud.p.*14. as to this Point of *Idolatry*; and that the Compilers of the *Homilies* were the more earnest *in this Point of removing or excluding Images, the better to wean the People from the Sin of Idolatry, in which they had been trained up from their very Infancy.* And after, he adds, *the People of this last Age, being sufficiently instructed in the Unlawfulness of worshipping such painted Images, they may be lawfully used in Churches, without Fear of Idolatry.* What can this signifie, if he did not take the *Worship* of *Images* to be *Idolatry*? And therefore he could not look upon this *as a Heat in the Beginning of the Reformation*; and which was quite spent in the time

of

of B. *Laud*; ſince not only *P. Heylin*, but the *Archbiſhop* himſelf ſaith, *that the Modern Church of* Rome *is too like Paganiſm in the Worſhip of Images, and driven to ſcarce intelligible Subtilties, in her Servants Writings that defend it; and this without any Care had of Millions of Souls unable to underſtand her Subtilties or ſhun her Practice.* And in his Defence againſt the Charge of the *Commons*, he ſaid, *That he had written againſt the Adoration and ſuperſtitious Uſe of Images as fully as any Man whatſoever.* What think you now Sir? was this a *Heat* in the Beginning of the *Reformation*; and when Men in *Archbiſhop Laud*'s time, more duly weighed the Conſequences of this Charge, they grew both cooler and wiſer? What Evidence doth *T. G.* produce for this? When the very Perſon he produces for it, is ſo far from it, that he ſaith the contrary; and are we not like to meet with very hopeful Demonſtrations in the *Scientifical Way* from him? But I have one Argument yet more, to prove there was no ſuch Change as to this Matter, in *Archbiſhop Laud*'stime; which is from the *Convocation*, *A. D.* 1640. wherein no one queſtions the Influence and Direction of *Archbiſhop Laud*, and the Concurrence of thoſe of his *Party*, as *T. G.* calls them; and yet in that very *Book* of *P. Heylin*'s, he might have ſeen that *Canon*, wherein they acknowledge *the Idolatry of the Maſs:* And *T. G.* could not pretend any Ignorance of this; for Dr. *St.* had quoted this very *Canon* to this Purpoſe, to ſhew that this was the Senſe of *Archbiſhops*, *Biſhops* and *Clergy* in *Convocation* ſo lately; and ſo long after the firſt *Heats* of the *Reformation.* But what Anſwer doth *T. G.* give to this, which is ſo material a Teſtimony, and ſo deſtructive to all he ſaith, upon this matter?

Conference with *Fiſher. p.* 277.

Hiſtory of his Tryal. *p.* 472.

*Cypr. Angl. p.* 435.

*R. P.* I do not remember he takes notice of it; but if you pleaſe I will look, for I have his *Book* about me.

*P. D.* Not take Notice of it? It is impoſſible. What! doth he pretend to anſwer, and paſs by the plaineſt and ſtrongeſt Arguments, as if they had never been brought? This is a very Satisfactory Way of anſwering, and becoming the Ingenuity of *T. G.* But I pray Sir look again, I am afraid you wrong him. I ſuppoſe you never read Dr. *St.*'s Books, but only the *Anſwers* to them; and then I do not wonder you applaud the *Anſwers*, if they leave out the hardeſt Arguments.

*R. P.* You have a little ſtartled me with this Omiſſion: I have turn'd over all the Leaves, which relate to this matter, very carefully, and I cannot find One Word about it; ſurely it was an involuntary Omiſſion.

*P. D.* How could that be involuntary, when it was produced and urged with great Force, to ſhew that this was *no Puritanical Charge*; no *Heat* at *the Beginning of the Reformation*; no *private Opinion* of particular Perſons, but the *Senſe* of our whole *Church repreſentative*, even in *A. D.* 1640.

*R. P.* I confeſs, I know not what to ſay more for him, but that it was an *Omiſſion.*

*P. D.* No Sir, that is not all; for there is a Fault of *Commiſſion* too; for he doth not only leave out this, but he advances an *Hypotheſis*, which he might eaſily ſee the Falſhood of, from this ſingle Teſtimony; *viz.* that the Charge of *Idolatry* was only *a Heat in the Beginning of the Reformation, which was diſowned in the Time of K.* Charles *and Archbiſhop Laud*; when at the ſame time he could not but ſee the plaineſt Evidence to the contrary by the *Convocation* of *A. D.* 1640. Is your Cauſe to be ſupported only by ſuch Tricks as theſe?

Dial. p. 28. *R. P.* You are too like Dr. *St.* whom *T. G.* charges *with being too Tragical upon ſuch ſlight Occaſions*; and flinging and laying about him unreaſonably for a thing of nothing; as when *T. G.* miſtook *Robert Abbot* for *George*.

*P. D.* Call you this a *thing* of *nothing*? Methinks it is rather making *nothing* of a very ſubſtantial *thing*. As to the other Miſtake, I ſuppoſe we ſhall hear of it e're long. I pray let us proceed in Order.

*R. P.* Dr. *St.*'s third Argument is from the *Rubrick* at the End of the *Communion*; the Words are theſe, *Whereas it is ordained in this Office, for the Adminiſtration of the Lords Supper; that the Communicants ſhall receive the ſame kneeling.*

*F. C.* Hold there I pray; what! *receive the Communion kneeling*! Give me leave to come in now; for I perceive you are hard preſſed, and we ought to give friendly Aſſiſtance to one another againſt theſe *Church-of-England-men*; and therefore I will prove them guilty of *Idolatry* in receiving the *Sacrament kneeling*.

*P. D.* This will be a Digreſſion; but I always owe ſo much Service to the *Church* of *England*, as to be ready to defend it from ſo unjuſt a Charge; therefore to your Buſineſs.

*F. C.* Mr. *Caſe* in his *Sermon* before the *Long Parliament* at a *General Faſt*, on ſuch a Day ſaith thus——

*P. D.* I pray, Sir, ſpeak to the Point: I am not now at leiſure to hear Mr. *Caſe*'s *Sermon* repeated.

*F. C.* I hope you will not interrupt me.

*P. D.* Not, when you ſpeak to the Buſineſs: Do you underſtand what *Idolatry* is?

*F. C.* That is a Queſtion to be asked indeed; as though I did not know what *the Cup of Fornication* means, that is *Idolatry*; and *to bow at the Name of Jeſus*, and *to bow to the Altar*, that is *Idolatry*; do you think I do not know what *Idolatry* is? Methinks you ſhould have more Reverence for a Man of my Years, than to ask me ſuch a ſawcy Queſtion; have I preached this Thirty Years and more in the *Army*, and *in private Congregations*, and live to be asked ſuch a Queſtion by you? Sir, I knew what *Idolatry* was before you were born.

*P. D.* Then I hope you can tell me, now I am of Age to underſtand it.

*F. C.* Why, have I not told you already?

*P. D.* I pray, Sir, let us talk calmly, and underſtand one another; which we ſhall never do unleſs we agree what is *Idolatry*. I pray give me the *Definition* of it.

*F. C.* The *Definition*! When I was a young Man as you are, I had as many Definitions in my Head as any Body; but we that are upon conſtant Duties of another Nature cannot trouble our Heads with Definitions, or ſuch idle Notions. But alas! we grow old, and ſuch things are ſoon forgotten. I remember in my younger Days, I read *Bucanus*, *Polanus*, and *Ameſius*; nay, there was not a good *Syſtem* of *Orthodox Divinity* to be had, but I read it, and noted it: But I loſt my *Notes* in the time of the *Wars*, and could never recover them.

*P. D.* This is a little off from our Buſineſs; I hope you are better at *Application* of the Point, than at *Explication* of it. What is it in the *Church* of *England* you do charge with *Idolatry*?

*F. C.* *Kneeling at the Sacrament.*

*P. D.* For what Reaſon?

*F. C.*

*F. C.* Stay a little: I thought I had my Arguments at my Fingers Ends; but see how strangely good things slip out of our Memories! But now I remember, I have some short Notes about me, which I took out of Mr. *Gillespie's Idolatry of the English Popish Ceremonies*; and let me tell you, he was a mighty Man in his Days against the *Church* of *England*; and this *Book* of his did great Execution upon the *Bishops* in *Scotland*. I can remember, how much it affected the *Brethren* in *England*; and how we compared him to one of *Davids Worthies*, that killed the *Giants* of the *Philistins*.

*P. D.* Sir, at this Rate of Talking, it will be Night before you come to the *Question*; methinks you seem to have nothing to say against us of the *Church* of *England*.

*F. C.* I nothing to say against you! who ever heard me, without having something to say against you? I tell you Sir, I look upon your *Church* as the younger *Sister* to the *Whore* of *Babylon*: Never a Barrel the better Herring; only we can have *Liberty* of *Conscience* with one, and not with the other. It is all one to me *to bow to an Image*, and *to bow to the Altar*; to *worship Images*, and to *kneel* at the *Sacrament*.

*P. D.* I am in hopes you are now coming to the Point, I pray keep there without any farther *rambling*.

*F. C.* Call you this *rambling*? You know *Amesius* saith, even in controverted Points, much Respect ought to be had to the *Experience* of *God's People*; I tell you, I have found it thus with me, and you ought rather to hear me teach you, than dispute with me.

*P. D.* All this shall not serve; I must have your Arguments since you urge me thus.

*F. C.* Why look ye now, d'ye see how petulant and malapert these *Divines* of the *Church* of *England* are. But since nothing will satisfy you, but arguing, I have an Argument ready for you will do your Business.

*To worship the Bread is Idolatry*;
*But to kneel at the Sacrament is to worship the Bread.*
Ergo.

*P. D.* I am glad to find you come to any kind of *Reasoning*. I deny, that in kneeling at the Sacrament, *we do worship the Bread*; for our *Church* expressly declares the contrary in this *Rubrick*.

*F. C.* What do I care for your *Church*, or her *Rubricks*? I say you do worship the Bread, and prove it too.

*That which you kneel before and look towards, when you worship, you do give the Worship to:*
*But you kneel before and look towards the Bread when you worship.*
Ergo.

*P. D.* I begin to be afraid of you now; for you do not only prove by this Argument *kneeling at the Sacrament*, but *reading* the *Common Prayer* to be *Idolatry*: For if that which we kneel before and look towards when we worship, must be the *Object* of our *Worship*, it is plain we must indeed make an *Idol* of the *Common Prayer*; for every time we read it we kneel before it, and looks towards it when we worship.

*F. C.* Look you to that, I always took the *Common Prayer* for an *Idol*, but I did not think I had proved it now.

*P. D.* I shall endeavour to undeceive you in this Matter. Since we are not pure Spirits, but must worship *God* with our Bodies, by *kneeling* and looking towards something in our *Acts* of *Worship*; we must not determine

mine that to be the *Object* of our *Worſhip* which our Bodies are bended towards, or we look upon in our *Worſhip*, unleſs there be ſome other *Reaſon* for it ; for then *Idolatry* would be neceſſary and unavoidable. For we cannot kneel with our Eyes open, but we muſt look upon ſome Creature, which according to your way of arguing, muſt be the *Object* of our *Worſhip*. I pray Sir, without being angry, give me leave to ask you, whether a Man kneeling in the Fields and praying with his Eyes lifted up to *Heaven* be an *Idolater* or not ?

*F. C.* I think not.

*P. D.* Yet he kneels towards ſome Creature, and looks upon ſome Creature when he worſhips; therefore you muſt prove by ſome other way, that we do make the *Bread* the *Object* of our *Worſhip*. But this we utterly deny ; and ſay *the doing it is* Idolatry *and to be abhorred of all faithful Chriſtians*. And will you make us worſhip it, whether we will or no ?

*F. C.* But you uſe the ſame Poſtures which the *Papiſts* do, and yet you charge them with *Idolatry*.

*P. D.* Becauſe this is a thing many of you ſtumble at, I will make the Difference of our Caſe and theirs plain to you. In all Moral Acts we are to have a great Regard to their *Circumſtances*, from whence they take a different Denomination. He that kills a Man by Accident, and he that kills a Man out of Malice, do the very ſame thing as to the Subſtance of the *Act* ; yet no Man will ſay it is the ſame Act upon a Moral Conſideration. We kneel, and the *Papiſts* kneel : But we declare *when we kneel, we intend no Adoration to the Elements* : But the *Papiſts* cannot deny that they do give *proper Adoration* to that which is before them ; which we ſay is *Bread*, and they ſay, *the Body of Chriſt under the Species of Bread* ; and yet not merely to the *inviſible Body of Chriſt*, but taking the *Species* of *Bread* as *united* to that *Body* of *Chriſt*, and ſo directing their Worſhip to theſe Two together as the *proper Objects of Divine Adoration*. And to make this evident to you, their *Adoration* is performed at the *Elevation* of the *Hoſt* ; and at the *carrying it about in Proceſſions*, and at the *expoſing it on their Altars* ; and not merely in the *Participation* of it. Whence it is obſervable, that the *Church* of *Rome* doth not ſtrictly require *kneeling* at the *Participation*, which it would do, if it looked on the *kneeling* at receiving as a proper *Act* of *Adoration*. The *Rubricks* of the *Maſs* do not, that I can find, require the *Prieſt* to *kneel* in the *Act* of *receiving* ; and the *Pope* when he celebrates, *receives ſitting*. *Eſpencæus* ſaith, in the *Church* of *Lyons*, many of the *People* did not receive kneeling ; and upon Complaint made about it, they were by the Advice of Two *Cardinals* left to their old Cuſtom. And I wonder your Brethren have not taken notice of the Difference of *kneeling* at the *Elevation* of the *Hoſt*, and in the *Act* of *receiving* it ; the one was required by the *Conſtitution* of *Honorius*, and was intended for an Act of *Adoration* to the *Hoſt* : The other was derived from the *Ancient Church*, which altho' it did not always uſe the *ſame Poſture* of *Adoration* that we do ; yet it is ſufficient for our purpoſe, if they received the *Sacrament* in the *ſame Poſture in which they worſhipped God*. And this I could eaſily prove, if this were a Place or Seaſon for it.

*F. C.* Well Sir, I do not love *Diſputing* ; I pray go on with your former Adverſary.

*R. P.* Sir, I thank you for the Diverſion you have given us; if you pleaſe I will now return to the Place where we left ; I was about to

tell

tell you the Answer *T. G.* gives to Dr. *St*'s Third *Argument* from the *Rubrick* at the end of the *Communion*. The Words are, *It is here declared that by kneeling no Adoration is intended or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental Bread or Wine, there Bodily received, or unto any Corporal Presence of Christ's Natural Flesh and Blood. For the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very Natural Substances, and therefore may not be adored, for that were Idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians; and the Natural Body and Blood of Christ are in Heaven, and not here; it being against the Truth of Christ's Natural Body to be at one time in more Places than one.* About which Dr. *St.* charges *T. G.* first with *Ignorance* in saying, *It was not yet above a Dozen Years since it was inserted into the Communion Book; whereas he might have found it above a hundred Years before in the Liturgy of* Edw. VI. To which *T. G.* answers, *That the various Fate of this Rubrick, first in not being annexed till the second Liturgy of* Edward VI. *and being cast out again in the Year* 1562; *and then admitted again almost a hundred Years after, is no Eviction to him, that the Charge of Idolatry is the dogmatical Doctrine of the Church of* England. *Dial. p. 19.*

*P. D.* If this were all the Declaration our *Church* had made of her Sense, and the Intention of this *Rubrick* were only to declare this Point of *Idolatry*, there were some Probability in what *T. G.* suggests. But I have shewed already, how fully our *Church* hath declared her Sense about *Romish Idolatry* by other ways; and the Design of this *Rubrick* was not to express her Sense of *Idolatry*, so much as to give Satisfaction to those who scrupled the *Lawfulness* of *Kneeling*. For which Cause it was first put in, and afterwards not thought necessary to be continued, when Persons were better satisfied about the Intention of our *Church*. But when after long Disuse and violent Prejudices the *Dissenters* were grown unacquainted with the Design and Intention of our *Church*, there was the same Reason for inserting it again, which held at first for putting it in. And what now hath *T. G.* gained by this Observation? If it had been, as he imagined, what he had gotten in one Point, he had lost in another: For then it would appear, that there was *no such Heat in the beginning of Queen* Elizabeth's *Days*; if they were willing to leave out such a *Declaration* of the *Idolatry* of the *Church* of *Rome*, at that time when Queen *Elizabeth*'s *Title was the most disputed at* Rome; so that from hence appears the Vanity of *T. G.*'s former Observation, and how far they were from taking things into our *Liturgy* out of Spite to the *Pope*; nay, so far were they from this, that in the first Year of Queen *Elizabeth*, that Petition in the *Litany* was left out, which had been inserted by *Henry* VIII. and continued in both *Liturgies* of *Edward* VI. *From the Tyranny of the Bishop of* Rome, *and all his detestable Enormities, Good Lord*———And this he might have found in the same Historian. *Cypr. Ang. p. 418.* And was not the Title of *Head* of the *Church*, taken by her *Father* and *Brother*, so qualified and explained then, as might prevent any occasion of Quarreling at it by the most captious Persons? Do these Passages look like doing things on purpose to provoke and exasperate, and out of pure spite to the Pope; or like putting in things on purpose to heighten the Differences, when *T. G.* himself confesses, *they left out this Rubrick*; and it is evident they did leave out some of the most provoking Expressions?

*R. P.* I see you cannot bear the Charge of *intemperate Heat* on the *beginning of the Reformation.*

*P. D.*

*P. D.* I cannot bear ſuch an unreaſonable and unjuſt Imputation as this is; and I have a particular Eſteem for the *Wiſdom*, *Learning* and *Piety* which was ſhewed in the *Eccleſiaſtical Part* of our *Reformation.* But how doth *T. G.* take off the *Charge* of *Idolatry* in this *Rubrick?*

*R. P.* He ſaith, *he takes the meaning of it not to be, the denying Adoration to be due in regard of Chriſt's Body being preſent ſpiritually, but truly in the Sacrament; but only that no Adoration ought to be done to any Corporal Preſence of Chriſt's Natural Fleſh and Blood, as the Word Corporal is taken to ſignify the Natural Manner of a Body's being preſent.* For which he gives theſe Reaſons, (1.) *Becauſe thoſe Words in the Second Liturgy of* Edward VI. *No Adoration ought to be done to any Real or Eſſential Being of Chriſt's Natural Fleſh and Blood, are now changed into* [*any Corporal Preſence of Chriſt's Natural Fleſh and Blood.*] (2.) *Becauſe the Proteſtant Divines do yield the Real Preſence of Chriſt's Body, for which he quotes Biſhop* Taylor *and Biſhop* Coſins; and he deſires Dr. *St. ſo to explain theſe Words, as not to undermine the conſtant Doctrine of the Church of* England *concerning the Real Preſence, and leave us nothing but pure* Zuinglianiſm *in the Place of it.*

Dial p. 21.

*P. D.* I am ſo much his Friend, that at this time I will undertake this Task for him. Firſt, We muſt conſider the *Words* of the *Rubrick.* (2.) How this Senſe of it can be reconciled with the *Real Preſence* as owned by the *Church* of *England.*

(1.) For the meaning of the *Rubrick*, We are to conſider that the *Rubrick* denies *Adoration to be intended, either unto the Sacramental Bread and Wine, or unto any Corporal Preſence of Chriſt's Natural Fleſh and Blood.* And after, it gives Two diſtinct Reaſons for denying *Adoration* to *either* of theſe. 1. *To the Sacramental Bread and Wine*, for this Reaſon, *becauſe they remain ſtill in their very Natural Subſtances; and therefore may not be adored, for that were Idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Chriſtians.* 2. *To the Corporal Preſence of Chriſt's Natural Fleſh and Blood;* becauſe *the Natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Chriſt are in Heaven, and not here, it being againſt the Truth of Chriſt's Natural Body, to be at one time in more Places than one.* You ſee, here are Two plainly diſtinct Reaſons given for denying *Adoration* to the *Elements*, and to *the Natural Body of Chriſt.* The former is ſaid to be *Idolatry*; the latter to be *abſurd* and *unreaſonable, it being repugnant to the Truth of Chriſt's Body to be in more Places than one at one time.* So that the Senſe of the *Rubrick* lies in theſe Two Propoſitions.

1. That it is *Idolatry* to give *Adoration* to the *Elements remaining in their Natural Subſtances.*

2. That it is abſurd to believe *Chriſt's Natural Body to be preſent, becauſe then it muſt be in more Places than one, which is repugnant to the Truth of a Body.* Theſe things to my Apprehenſion are the plain and natural Senſe of this *Rubrick.*

*R. P.* But we do not give Adoration to the *Sacramental Elements*, but to the *Body* of *Chriſt.*

*P. D.* I do believe I can prove that you give *Adoration* to the *Sacramental Elements*, as they make up *one entire Object of Adoration with the Body of Chriſt*; but that is not my preſent Buſineſs; which is to ſhew the Senſe of our *Church*, which lies in theſe particulars. 1. That *the Sacramental Elements do remain in their Natural Subſtances after Conſecration.* 2. That, *to adore them ſo remaining is Idolatry, and to be abhorred of all faithful Chriſtians.* No one queſtions the former to be the Senſe of our *Church*; the only Queſtion lies in the latter, whether that be

*Idola-*

*Idolatry* or no? It is no queſtion, that to give Divine Adoration to *any Creature* is *Idolatry*; and it is ſo acknowledged on all ſides; the only Queſtion then can be, whether the *Subſtance of Bread and Wine be a Creature* or not? And this is no Queſtion with any Man in his Wits: Therefore to give *Adoration* to the *Subſtance of Bread and Wine* is *Idolatry*. No Demonſtration in *Euclid* is plainer than this.

*R. P.* But I tell you, *we do not worſhip the Creature, but the Body of Chriſt.*

*P. D.* I tell you again, *if there be a Creature you do worſhip it*; for you give Adoration to what is before you, be it what it will; if it be a *Creature* you adore it.

*R. P.* But we ſay, *it is not a Creature we worſhip.*

*P. D.* Do not you give *Adoration* to that which is *conſecrated*, whether it remains a *Creature* or not after *Conſecration*? At the *Elevation* of the *Hoſt*, at the *Carrying it about*, at the *Expoſing of it on the Altar*, you worſhip that which was *conſecrated*, do you not?

*R. P.* We worſhip *that which was Bread* before *Conſecration*, but after is no longer ſo, but the *Body of Chriſt.*

*P. D.* But if it ſhould remain *Bread* after *Conſecration*, what do ye adore then? Is it not the *Subſtance* of the *Bread*?

*R. P.* Yes, but we believe *it is not the Bread.*

*P. D.* That is not the Queſtion, *what you believe*; for they that believed *God* to be the *Soul of the World*, worſhipped the Parts of it upon a Suppoſition, which if it had been true would have juſtified their Worſhip every Jot as well at yours can do you, and yet they were *groſs Idolaters* for all that. Nay, I will ſay more to you, there never were *Idolaters* in the World, that did not proceed upon a falſe Suppoſition; and it may be not ſo unreaſonable as yours. This cannot therefore excuſe you, if your Suppoſition proves falſe; as no doubt it is; that the *Subſtance of the Bread doth not remain after Conſecration.* But I now ask you what your *Adoration* is, in the Opinion of thoſe Perſons who do firmly believe the *Sacramental Elements to remain in their Natural Subſtances.* Is it not the *giving Divine Worſhip to a Creature*? And is not the *giving Divine Worſhip to a Creature, Idolatry*? So that according to the *Senſe* of our *Church* the *Worſhip* of the *Hoſt* muſt be *Idolatry.*

*R. P.* But what have you got by all this? For we confeſs our ſelves; *That if the Subſtance of Bread and Wine do remain after Conſecration, we are as great Idolaters as they that worſhip a red Cloth.*

*P. D.* Upon my Word, you had need then to be well aſſured, *that the Subſtance of Bread and Wine do not remain*; and yet I muſt tell you, we can be certain of nothing in the World, if we are not certain *that the Subſtance of Bread and Wine do remain after Conſecration.* For if we are certain of nothing by our Senſes, but of the *outward Accidents* (which is all your beſt Men do ſay in this Caſe) we cannot be certain of any *viſible Subſtance* in the World; for no *bodily Subſtance* can be diſcerned, but by our *Senſes*; and ſo all Foundation of *Certainty by Senſe* is deſtroyed. Nay, farther, it takes away all *Certainty* by *Reaſon*; for it confounds the cleareſt Maxims of it, by overthrowing all Mathematical Proportions of *great* and *ſmall*, *whole* and *parts*; by deſtroying all *Notions* of *Diſtance* and *Place*; by jumbling the *Notions* of *Body* and *Spirit.* And laſtly, it takes away all *Certainty* by *Revelation*, which can never come to us, but upon the Suppoſition of the *Certainty* of *Senſe* and *Reaſon.*

*R. P.* O Sir, I see what you would be at; you would fain draw me into a Dispute about *Transubstantiation*, upon *Principles* of *Reason*; I beg your Pardon, Sir. This is a Matter of *Faith*, and must be stoutly believed, or else we are gone. No more of this, Sir; to your Business of *Idolatry*, I pray.

*P. D.* I was only giving you some Caution by the by, how much you are concerned to look about you; but since you are resolved to shut your Eyes, I return to the Sense of our *Church* about the *Idolatry* of the *Mass*; and it follows necessarily from our former Discourse, that since our *Church* believes the Substance of the Elements do remain, and that your Worship doth really fix upon that *Substance*; whatever your Intentions be, it is really *Idolatry*.

*R. P.* However this only proves it to be *Material Idolatry*, and not *Formal*.

*P. D.* I have often heard of this Distinction, but I could never be satisfied with it: For what is *Material* and *Formal Idolatry*?

*R. P. Material Idolatry* I take to be *Mistaken Worship*; *i. e.* I do give Divine Worship to a false Object; but I do not intend to give it to a false Object of Worship, but to a true one.

*P. D.* Then *Formal Idolatry* must be *giving Divine Worship to a false Object of Worship, knowing it to be a false Object.* And where are there any such *Idolaters* to be found in the World? Did not the Heathens believe that to be *God* which they worshipped? And is not *God a true Object of Worship*? only they mistook that to be *God* which was not; and so were only *Material Idolaters*: Even those that worshipped their *Images for Gods*, were only mistaken; for they had a good Intention only to worship *God*, but they unhappily took their *Images* for *Gods*. And I must needs say, they who took the *Sun*, *Moon* and *Stars* for *Gods*, and worshipped them as such, were very excusable in comparison of those who take a *Piece of Bread for God*, or that which *appears like it*.

*R. P.* You are very severe, methinks; but do you think there is no Difference among *Idolaters*?

*P. D.* Yes, I tell you there is, but not much to your Comfort. The grosser Men's Error is, the more Means to convince Men of it; the more Wilful their Blindness and Continuance in it, the more Culpable they are in their *Idolatry*, and consequently the less Excusable.

*R. P.* But may not a Man innocently mistake? as if in the Dark, a *Child* should ask Blessing of one that is not his *Father*, would his *Father* have Reason to be angry with him?

*P. D.* Not for once, or if it were in the Dark; but if he should see him every Day go very formally to a *Joynt-Stool* in the *Hall*, or to a *Brown Loaf* in the *Buttery*, and there very solemnly down upon his Knees to them, and beg their Blessing; tell me what you think the Father would say to such a Mistake? Would he excuse him, saying, Alas poor Child, he intended all this to me, only he mistook the *Brown Loaf* or a *Joynt-Stool* for me!

*R. P.* Forbear such Comparisons; for we have Divine Revelation, *This is my Body*; and we believe his Word against all you can say in this Matter.

*P. D.* But what will you say, if by the Confession of many of the best and most learned of your own Divines, *You have not Divine Revelation for it*; and that those Words cannot prove, *that the Substance of Bread doth not remain after Consecration*, which is the thing we now enquire

quire after? And if it were not to go off from our present Business, I would undertake to prove this evidently to you.

*R. P.* However we have the *Authority* of our *Church* for it.

*P. D.* You had as good say, you are resolved to believe it; for the *Authority* of your *Church* can never perswade any Man that is not.

*R. P.* When you are gotten to this Point of *Transubstantiation*, it is hard to get you off. It is the sore Place of our *Church*, and you are like *Flies in Summer*, always busy about it. I pray return to your *Rubrick*, for you seem to have forgotten it.

*P. D.* No, I have been pursuing it hitherto.

*R. P.* But what say you to *T. G*'s Reasons, *why this must be understood of a Corporeal Presence of Christ's Natural Body, because you else overthrow the Doctrine of a Real Presence which hath been accounted the Doctrine of the Church of* England.

*P. D.* To this I answer, (1.) The *Rubrick* saith expressly, *That it is against the Truth of Christ's Natural Body to be at one time in more Places than one.* It doth not say *against the Corporeal Presence of his Natural Body*, but the *Truth of it*: From whence it follows, that our *Church* believes the *true Natural Body of Christ*, which was born of the Virgin, suffered on the Cross, and ascended into Heaven, *can be but in one Place*; which is declared in the foregoing Words, *And the Natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in Heaven and not here*; *i. e.* in Heaven exclusively from being in the *Sacrament*. Which are not true, if the same *Natural Body* of *Christ* could be at the *same time* in *Heaven* and in the *Host*.

*R. P.* How then can your Divines hold *a Real Presence of Christ's Body*, as *T. G.* saith they do?

*P. D.* You had heard if you had staid till I came to my Second *Answer*, which is, That notwithstanding this, our *Church* doth hold, that after Consecration, the Elements do become the Body and Blood of Christ, and so there is *a Real Presence* of *Christ's Body*; but not of his *Natural* but of a *Mystical Body*. I will endeavour to make this out to you, because you look strangely upon me, as if I were big of some mighty *Paradox*. When *Paschasius Radbertus* did first broach the Modern Doctrine of the *Roman Church*, about the *same Body* of *Christ* being in the *Sacrament*, *which was born of the Blessed Virgin*, in the *Western Church*, he met with great Opposition therein from the most learned Divines of that Age; amongst the rest, there lived then in the Court of *Carolus Calvus* a Man very Eminent for his Learning, called *John Scotus*, or *Erigena*. This Man at the Request of *Carolus Calvus* delivered his Opinion directly contrary to *Paschasius*; for whereas he asserted, *That the very same Body of Christ which was born of the Blessed Virgin, was invisibly present under the Accidents of Bread and Wine*; *Scotus* denied, *that the Elements were in any Real Sense after Consecration the Body and Blood of Christ*; *the Sacrament being only a bare Commemoration, or figurative Representation of the Body and Blood of Christ.* So *Hincmarcus*, who lived in that Age delivers his Opinion; which was afterwards taken up by *Berengarius*, as appears by *Lanfrank*'s Answer to him. And *Ascelinus* in his *Epistle* to *Berengarius* shews, that *John Scotus* out of Opposition to *Paschasius*, set himself to prove from the *Fathers*, *that what was consecrated on the Altar was not truly and really the Body and Blood of Christ.* These Two opposite Doctrines being thus dispersed, and a *Schism* being likely to break out upon it, as appears both by *Ratramnus*, and the *Anonymous Author*, published by *Cellotius*, (and extant in MS. in the *Cotton*

Hincmar. de praedest. c. 31. Lanfranc. de Corp. & Sang. Christ. c. 4.

*ton Library*) *Carolus Calvus* ſends to *Ratramnus* (an Eminent *Divine* of that *Age*, being employed by the *Gallican Church* to defend the *Latins* againſt the *Greeks*) to know his Judgment in this Matter. He (who is better known by the Name of *Bertram*) gives in his Preface an *Account* to his *Prince* of both theſe Opinions, and rejects them both, as againſt the Senſe of the *Fathers* and *Doctrine* of the *Church*. In the *firſt Part* of his Book, he diſputes againg *Scotus* who would allow no *Myſtery*; and in the *Second* againſt *Paſchaſius* who contended, *That the ſame Body of Chriſt was in the Sacrament, which was born of the Bleſſed Virgin*: This, he ſaith, was the State of the Second *Queſtion*, *Whether that very Body of Chriſt which ſits at the Right Hand of God, be received by Believers in the Sacramental Myſtery*? And he proves the *Negative* at large from the Teſtimonies of the *Fathers*; ſhewing, *That they did put a difference between that Body of Chriſt which was born of the Virgin, and ſuffered on the Croſs, and that true but Myſtical Body of Chriſt on the Altar*; *and ſo from the Teſtimonies of St.* Ambroſe, *St.* Auguſtin, *St.* Hierom, Fulgentius; *from the Scriptures*; *and from the Offices of the Church*; he concludes Point-Blank againſt *Paſchaſius*, That *it was not the ſame Body of Chriſt in the Sacrament which was born of the Bleſſed Virgin.* But then againſt the Opinion of *Scotus*, he delivers his Mind fully in Anſwer to the firſt *Queſtion*, ſaying, *If there were nothing in the Sacrament but what appeared to the Senſes, it was unfitly call'd a Myſtery*; *and there would be no Exerciſe for Faith*; *no Change at all wrought in the Elements*; *the Sacrament would fall ſhort of Baptiſm, and the Manna in the Wilderneſs*: *And laſtly, to what purpoſe did Chriſt promiſe his Fleſh to be the Food of his People*? *which being not to be underſtood carnally and literally, muſt have a ſpiritual Signification*; *ſo that, though as to their outward Appearance the Sacramental Elements are Figures*; *yet according to the inviſible Power and Efficacy they are the Body and Blood of Chriſt.* And this he ſhews to have been the Senſe of the *Fathers* and *Chriſtian Church*. This Opinion of *Ratramnus*, *Paſchaſius* in his Epiſtle to *Frudegardus*, calls *the Doctrine of thoſe who deny the Preſence of Chriſt's Fleſh in the Sacrament*; *but do hold an inviſible Power and Efficacy in and with the Elements*; *becauſe*, ſay they, *there is no Body but what is viſible and palpable.* And whoever will read that *Epiſtle* of *Paſchaſius* will find the Expreſſions he anſwers, the very ſame that yet occur in the Book of *Bertram.* Of the ſame Opinion with *Ratramnus* in this Matter, was *Rabanus Maurus*, the greateſt Divine accounted of his Age, who wrote his *Epiſtle* to *Egilo*, *againſt them who had lately broached that Doctrine*, (mark that) *that the Body of Chriſt in the Sacrament, was the very ſame which was born of the bleſſed Virgin, and ſuffered on the Croſs, and roſe from the Dead.* And this appears from his *Epiſtle* to *Heribaldus* ſtill Extant; wherein he ſaith, *he declared in what Senſe the Sacrament was the Body of Chriſt.* Beſides, the *Anonymous Author* publiſhed by *Cellotius*, (the only Perſon about that time who appeared in behalf of the *Doctrine* of *Paſchaſius*, and very inconſiderable in compariſon of his *Adverſaries*) confeſſeth the Oppoſition made to *Paſchaſius* by *Rabanus* and *Ratramnus*, and endeavours to excuſe *his Simplicity in aſſerting, that the ſame Fleſh of Chriſt was upon the Altar, which was born of the Virgin*, by a new and extravagant Suppoſition of the *Sacrament* being the *Medium* of *uniting Two Real Bodies of Chriſt*; viz. *of his Fleſh and of his Church*, and therefore that muſt be a *Real Body of Chriſt* too; which is ſo remote from juſtifying *Paſchaſius*'s Doctrine, that *Cellotius* himſelf is aſhamed of him. This ſame Doctrine

ctrine of *Rabanus* and *Ratramnus* is expreſly owned by the *Saxon Homilies*, which deny the *Sacrament* to be a *mere Commemoration*; *according to the Opinion of* Joh. Erigena; but ſay, that *after Conſecration the Bread becomes the Body of Chriſt after a ſpiritual and myſtical manner*; and in the *Saxon Code* of *Canons* it is expreſly determined, *not to be that Body of Chriſt which ſuffered on the Croſs.* And this I aſſert to be the very ſame *Doctrine*, which the *Church* of *England* embraced upon the *Reformation*, as moſt conſonant to *Scripture* and the *Fathers*; which although it doth declare againſt *the natural Body of Chriſt being in more Places than one, even that Body of Chriſt which is in Heaven*; yet in the Articles it declares, *That the Body of Chriſt is given, taken and eaten; ſo that to the faithful Receivers, the Bread conſecrated, and broken, becomes the Communion of the Body of Chriſt; and the Cup of Bleſſing, the Communion of the Blood of Chriſt.* And ſo in the *Catechiſm* it is ſaid, *That the Body and Blood of Chriſt are verily and indeed taken of the faithful in the Lord's Supper*; *i. e.* that after Conſecration ſuch a *divine Power* and *Efficacy* doth accompany the *Holy Sacrament*, as makes the *Elements* to become the *Spiritual and Myſtical Body of Chriſt*; as the *Church* is *Really* but *Myſtically* the *Body* of *Chriſt*, becauſe of his *Spirit* dwelling in them. So the *Apology* of our *Church* ſaith, *That in the Lord's Supper there is truly exhibited the Body and Blood of Chriſt; becauſe that is the proper Food of our Souls, as Bread and Wine tends to the Nouriſhment of our Bodies.* And if the time would permit, I could not only more largely prove this to be the *Senſe* of our *Church*, but that it is the true and genuine Senſe of the *Fathers*, both of the *Greek* and *Latin Church.* And thus I hope, I have done that which *T. G.* thought ſo impoſſible a thing, *viz. to explain this Rubrick, ſo as not to undermine the Doctrine of the real Preſence aſſerted by the Church of* England, *nor to leave nothing but pure* Zuinglianiſm *in the Place of it.*

*R. P.* I was afraid of a *Paradox*, and it appears, not without Reaſon; for I never met with any one yet, who explain'd the Doctrine of *Bertram*, and the *Church* of *England*, after this manner; and all that attempted it talked ſo in the Clouds, that *Tranſubſtantiation* it ſelf did not ſeem more hard to underſtand: But I remember *P. de Marca* hath proved, that the *Book* of *Bertram* was the ſame which was written by *Joh. Scotus*; and therefore your *Hypotheſis* is utterly overthrown.

*P. D.* I have read and conſidered that faint Attempt of that *Great Man*, which ſeemed to be deſigned for no other End, but to make us believe, that *Bertram's Book* was *burned* for *Heretical*, at the *Synod* of *Vercelles*. But if any one will impartially conſider the *Book* of *Bertram*, and compare it with the Account given of the *Opinion* of *Joh. Scotus* by the *Writers* againſt *Berengarius*, they will find *De Marca's* Opinion without the leaſt Colour of Probability.

*R. P.* But *Card. Perron*, *Mauguin*, *Cellotius* and *Arnaud*, all ſay, That *Bertram* in the *firſt Part* diſputes againſt the *Stercoraniſts*, who were a ſort of *Hereticks* who held, *That the Body of Chriſt in the Euchariſt was paſſible, corruptible and digeſtible, and in all things juſt as the Bread appeared to our Senſes*; and aſſerted, *That all the Accidents of the Bread were founded Hypoſtatically in the Body of Chriſt, and not to have any proper Subſiſtence of their own.*

*P. D.* Theſe were a notable ſort of Hereticks, if they could be found; but it appears by the Enemies of *Berengarius*, that this opprobious Name was fixed by them on all thoſe who aſſerted *the Subſtance of the Bread to remain*

*remain after Conſecration*, and it would be very ſtrange, if *Bertram* ſhould confute that which himſelf aſſerts: For he ſaith, *The Sacramental Elements do paſs into the Nouriſhment of our Bodies.* But if any were liable to this Accuſation, it muſt be *Paſchaſius*; if *P. de Marca's* Obſervation of him be true, *That he held both Subſtance and Quantity of the Bread and Wine, to be turned into the Body of Chriſt*; from whence it follows, that muſt be the *Subject* of all thoſe *Accidents, which were in the Bread before*; which is the very ſink of *Stercoraniſm.* Nay, I am very much deceived, if *Pope Nicholas* II. in the *Recantation* preſcribed to *Berengarius*, did not fall into the Filth of it far more than *Rabanus* or *Heribaldus*; for he aſſerts therein, *That the Body of Chriſt is truly and ſenſibly handled, and broken by the Hands of Prieſts, and ground by the Teeth of Believers.* But what Place could be fitter for this *Hereſy*, than the *Sedes Stercoraria*? And *Guitmundus* ſtriving to help *Pope Nicholas* and his Council out, falls into the ſame *Hereſy* himſelf; for he ſhews *That Chriſt's Body may be handled and chewed in the Sacrament*; if ſo, it muſt be the *Subject* of the *Accidents* of the *Bread* and *Wine.* Which according to *Perron* and his *Followers*, is plain *Stercoraniſm.*

*Guitm. de ſacr. l.* 1.

*R. P.* But do not you fall into another *Hereſy*, viz. of *Impanation?*

*P. D.* A Man had need look to his Words, when *Hereſies* are ſo common, and buz ſo about a Man's Ears. And ſome think they confute a Man with a vengeance, if they can find out ſome *Hereſy* with a hard Name to faſten upon him. But if you did know wherein the *Hereſy* of *Impanation* lay, you would never charge this Doctrine of our *Church* with it. For I find Two diſtinct Ways of *Impanation*, and this Doctrine is liable to neither of them. 1. By Union of the *Bread* to the *Body* of *Chriſt*; and by *that* to the *Divinity*, which was the way of *Joh. Pariſienſis.* 2. By an *immediate Conjunction of the Divine Nature to the Bread*; not merely by *Divine Efficacy and Power*, but by an *Hypoſtatical Union*: Which is the Opinion, not without ground, attributed to *Rupertus Tuitienſis*; and is liable to this great Abſurdity, that all that befals the *Bread* may be attributed to the *Perſon* of *Chriſt*, which *Bellarmine* ſaith, *it is Blaſphemy to imagine.* And then it might be ſaid, *That the Bread is God, that the Word is made Bread*, and *that God is both Bread and Wine.* But all which the Doctrine of our *Church* implies, is only *a real Preſence of Chriſt's inviſible Power and Grace ſo in and with the Elements, as by the faithful receiving of them to convey ſpiritual and real Effects to the Souls of Men:* As the *Bodies* aſſumed by *Angels* might be called *their Bodies*, while they aſſumed them; or rather as the *Church* is the *Body of Chriſt*, becauſe of *his Spirit quickning and enlivening the Souls of Believers*; ſo the *Bread* and *Wine* after *Conſecration* are the *real*, but *the Spiritual and Myſtical Body of Chriſt.* If any one yet thinks, that ſome at leaſt of our *Divines* have gone farther than this, let them know, it is the *Doctrine* of our *Church* I am to defend, and not of every particular *Divine* in it; and if any do ſeem to ſpeak of the Preſence of *the very ſame Body which is in Heaven*, I deſire them in the *firſt Place* to reconcile that *Doctrine with* this *Dogmatical Aſſertion* at the End of this *Rubrick*; *that it is againſt the Truth of Chriſt's natural Body*, (not againſt the *corporal Preſence* of it) *to be at one time in more Places than one.* Let Men imagine what *kind* of *Preſence* they pleaſe of the *ſame Body*, I only deſire to know, *whether to be in Heaven, and to be in the Sacrament*, be to be in the *ſame or diſtinct Places*? If the *Places be diſtinct*, as no doubt *Heaven* and *Earth* are, then our *Church* declares, *That it is contra-*

*ry*

*ry to the Truth of Christ's Natural Body to be in more Places than One at one time.*

*R. P.* But cannot *God* annihilate that *Cylinder of Air* between the *Body* of *Christ* in *Heaven*, and the *Sacrament on the Altar*, and so make them both to be in *one Place*?

*P. D.* This is a very idle and extravagant Question; because, if it be granted, it only proves that there is nothing *between Christ's Body in Heaven, and the Host*; but it doth not prove *the Host to be that Body of Christ*; and withal, since so many Thousand *Hosts* are consecrated in a *Day*, you must suppose so much Air annihilated, as lies between *Christ's Body* and all those *Hosts*; but can any Man imagine *God* should annihilate so much Air every time a *Priest* consecrates? And I remember a good Saying of *Cajetan*, *Non est disputandum de divina potentia ubi de Sacramentis tractatur*; we must not dispute of *God's absolute Power* about the Matter of *Sacraments*; because these are so often celebrated, that we are to suppose no more than an ordinary Power to be employed about them. And suppose we should grant a thing possible by *God's absolute Power*, he saith, *It is Folly to assert all that to be in the Sacrament, which God can do.* However, this doth not reach this *Rubrick*, which supposes *distinct Places*, and saith, *It is contrary to the Truth of Christ's natural Body to be in more Places than One at one time.*

*Cajet. in Aquin. 3 p. q. 75 art. 1. & 2. & 3.*

*R. P.* But may not all this be understood, as *T. G.* suggests, *of the natural manner of a body's being present in more Places than one*, viz. *that it is repugnant to the Truth of Christ's natural Body to be naturally present, or in a corporeal manner, in more Places than one; but it may be naturally present but in one Place*; i. e. *by way of Extension or Quantity; but it may be present in more Places after another manner?*

*P. D.* I think you have strained for this, and it is your last *Effort*. To which I answer, (1.) It yields no Advantage to *T. G.*; for supposing that some of our *Divines* did hold it possible, *that the same Body might be present in several Places after a different manner*; yet how doth it hence follow, that the *Rubrick* doth not charge them who worship the *Substance of Bread and Wine with Idolatry?* (2.) Supposing the *Church* did fix this Charge upon those who worship the *Body of Christ* as present, I desire to know whether *another kind of Presence* would excuse from *Idolatry*? *i. e.* supposing that to worship *Christ's Body as corporeally present be Idolatry*, it would not be *Idolatry* to worship the *very same Body* as present after *another manner*? Which is all one, as to ask, whether, if it be *Idolatry* to worship a Man with his *Cloaths on*, it be likewise *Idolatry* to worship him with his *Cloaths off*? If it be the *very same Body*, let the manner of its *being* present be the same or different, it doth not alter the Nature or Reason of *Worship*. Only of the Two, it seems more unreasonable to worship an *invisible Body* than a *visible one*; for in a *visible Body*, he that worships is sure of *something* that he *sees*, but when he fancies an *invisible Body* present, he fancies something, which *if it were*, must *be seen*; and yet though *he cannot see it*, he resolves to *worship it*. (3.) It is altogether as unreasonable to believe, that a *Body may be present in several Places after a different manner*, as *after the same manner*. For wheresoever a *Body* is *really present*, let it be with *Extension* or *without*, it is so *in that Place* as *not to be in another*; *i. e.* the *Body of Christ* being in the *Host on the Altar*, is so there, as not to be on the *Floor*, or any other Place about it; for otherwise it could not be said to *be only under the Accidents*: I then ask, on what Account *the same Body* cannot be present

preſent in *Two places* at once after *the ſame manner*, and yet may be *after a different manner*? *Aquinas* ſaith, *it doth imply a contradiction for the ſame Body to be in ſeveral Places at once after the ſame manner*, i. e. *by way of Extenſion or Quantity*; becauſe, *it is neceſſary for the ſame thing to be undivided from it ſelf; but that which is in ſeveral Places muſt be divided from it ſelf.* But as *Conink* well obſerves, *this Argument proves it as impoſſible for the ſame Body to be in ſeveral Places after a different manner; for it is never the leſs divided from it ſelf by being in one Place after another manner than in the other: Tea it will be more divided, becauſe it will be after two ſeveral ways repugnant to each other. And it is much more eaſie to conceive, that a Body ſhould be in two ſeveral Places after a natural manner, than to be ſo in one Place; and in another, after ſuch a ſpiritual manner, as is very hard to be underſtood. It is much more repugnant*, ſaith *Mæratius*, *for the ſame Body to be extended and not extended, than to have a double Extenſion. If it be repugannt to the finite Nature of a Body, to be in more Places than one, becauſe then it might be preſent in all Places*; this, ſaith *Lugo*, *will hold againſt a Sacramental Preſence; for that comes nearer to a Divine Immenſity for a Body to be in more Places without Quantity, than with it. Suarez* and *Gamachæus* ſay, *This comes nearer to ubiquity, becauſe a Sacramental Preſence ſuppoſes the Body to be whole in every Part, which a Natural doth not.* And they grant, *that all the Contradictions which follow upon being preſent in ſeveral Places after a Natural Manner, will hold if the one be Natural and the other not*: *i. e.* That the ſame Body may be above it ſelf and below it ſelf, within it ſelf and without it ſelf; and may move with Two contrary Motions upwards and downwards, forwards and backwards; it may be hot in one Place and cold in another; it may be alive in one Place and dead in another; and which is the higheſt Contradiction, one would think, by Force of this Principle, *a Man may be damned in one Place and ſaved in another.* And no leſs a Man than *Yſambertus* hath defended the *poſſibility* of this, upon this Principle; *For*, ſaith he, *a Man as in one Place may be killed in a mortal Sin, and ſo be damned; whereas in another Place he may have Contrition* (and Abſolution) *and ſo be ſaved.* But *Vaſquez* asks an untoward Queſtion, *Suppoſe ſuch a Man be reduced to one Place, whether ſhall he be ſaved or damned? For he cannot then be both; and there is no more Reaſon he ſhould be put out of the State of Grace by the State of Sin, than out of the State of Sin by the State of Grace.* Such horrible Contradictions do Men run into, rather than let go an abſurd *Hypotheſis*: And *Suarez* confeſſeth, that *a Sacramental Preſence is liable to the ſame Contradictions, becauſe that ſuppoſeth a Capacity for Acts of the Mind under it.* (4.) I ſay, that aſſerting a *Body to be preſent Naturally in one Place, and Spiritually and indiviſibly in more*, doth involve *more Contradictions* in it, than to be preſent in ſeveral Places after a natural Manner. For the very manner of a *Body's* being *preſent indiviſibly* carries *Contradictions* along with it peculiar to it ſelf. For whereever there is a *Body*, there muſt be *Quantity*, and whereever there is *Quantity*, there muſt be *diviſibility*; how then can a *Diviſible Body* be *indiviſibly preſent*? If they ſay, *it is after the Manner of a Spirit*, that doth by no Means ſalve the *Contradiction*; for how can a *Body* be after *the Manner of a Spirit*? And if it can, how can the *Notion* of *Body* and *Spirit* be differenced from each other? If *actual Extenſion may be ſeparated from a Body*, why not *Quantity* it ſelf? Why may not *Diviſibility* be ſeparated from a *Line*? And *Two and Two* not make *actually Four*; ſuppoſing that they retain their *intrinſick Aptitude* to do it? What becomes

*Aq. 4. diſt. 44. q. 2. ar. 2.*

*Conink de ſacr. qu. 75. art. 3.*

*Mærat. de ſacr. diſp. 24. §. 1.*

*Lugo de Sacram. diſp. 5. §. 1.*

*Suarez in 3. p. diſp. 48. art. 1. §. 4.*

*Gamach. in 3. p. qu. 76. c 4.*

*Yſambert. qu. 75. diſp. 3. art. 8.*

*Vaſq. in 3. p. diſp. 109. c. 4. art. 6. n. 28.*

comes of the *Differences* of *greater* and *leſs*, ſince that which is *greater* may be *contained under the leſs*; and ſo the very ſame thing will be *greater* or *leſs*, *greater* and not *greater* than it ſelf? What Notion can we have of *Diſtance*, ſince here a *Body* is ſuppoſed to have all its *Organical Parts*, *Head*, *Breaſt*, *Legs* and *Feet*; and yet no *local Diſtance* between *Head* and *Feet*?

*R. P.* I ſee it is a dangerous thing to give you but a Hint about *Tranſubſtantiation*; if you but once take the Scent, you run on ſo faſt, that it is a very hard matter to take you off. I did not think this *Rubrick* could have held us thus long; but I ſee you were reſolved to have two or three Throws at *Tranſubſtantiation* in paſſing, though I warned you before about it.

*P. D.* No Sir, It was *T. G.*'s fixing ſuch an abſurd Senſe upon our *Church*, as though ſhe made it *Idolatry* to *Worſhip Chriſt's Body as preſent after a corporeal Manner, and not after another*, which made me inſiſt ſo long upon this.

*R. P.* What ſaith my *Fanatick Acquaintance* to all this? What! Sleeping?

*F. C.* Only a Nod or two: I hearkened a while, but I found you were about hard and unſavoury Notions; truly it was to me *no awakening Diſcourſe*.

*R. P.* Come, come we will keep you waking; we are now come to the *Puritan Cauſe*.

*F. C.* Ay, Ay, there is ſome *Life* in that.

*R. P.* What think you, was *Robert Abbot Biſhop* of *Salisbury* a *Puritan* or not?

*F. C.* What! a *Biſhop* a *Puritan*! A good one I warrant you: A *Puritan* in *Lawn Sleeves*! A *Puritan* with *Croſs* and *Surplice*! You know well what belongs to a *Puritan*, do you not? I tell you, there never was a true *Puritan* but abhorred theſe things with all his Heart. What do you tell me of a *Biſhop* of *Salisbury* for a *Puritan*? I ſay again, if he had been ſo, he would have taken his *Lawn Sleeves* and thrown them into the *Fire*.

*P. D.* But I pray, Sir, how comes in this *Diſcourſe* about Biſhop *Abbot*?

*R. P.* I will tell you: Among other *Divines* produced by Dr. *St.* to prove the Charge of *Idolatry* maintained againſt the *Church* of *Rome* in K. *James* his time, one was Biſhop *Abbot* in his *Anſwer* to *Biſhop. T. G.* takes this to be Archbiſhop *Abbot*, and excepts againſt him *as an Abbettor of the Puritan Party*; and tells from Dr. *Heylin*, *that on that Account it was thought neceſſary to ſuſpend him from his Metropolitical Viſitation*: Dr. *St.* makes Sport with his ſuſpending a *Biſhop* of *Salisbury* from *Metropolitical Juriſdiction*, and tells what ſtrange things thoſe of the *Church* of *Rome* can do with *Five Words*; and upbraids *T. G.* with *Ignorance* of our *Church*; and in truth, *is too Tragical* upon ſuch a ſlight Occaſion. Now *T. G.* proves, *that it was only a Miſtake of the Perſon, and not of his Quality*; *although Dr.* St. ſaith, *That he was never till now ſuſpected for a Puritan*.

*P. D.* Are you ſure of that?

*R. P.* Yes, *T. G.* ſaith ſo, more than once. *Dial. p. 25. 27.*

*P. D.* However it is good to be ſure. Theſe are Dr. *St.*'s Words. *The two firſt he excepts againſt, are the Two Archbiſhops*, Whitgift *and* Abbot *as Puritanically inclined; but as it unhappily falls out, one of them was never*

*never mentioned by me, and the other never till now ſuſpected for a Puritan.* I pray adviſe *T. G.* to read a little more carefully, before he confutes: Is it not plain, that he means, *Archbiſhop* Abbot *was never mentioned by him, and Archbiſhop* Whitgift *was never till now ſuſpected for a Puritan?* It could be no Want of Underſtanding in *T. G.* to make him thus miſconſtrue his Words.

*R. P.* But he proves, *he was Puritanically inclined; and takes off his Teſtimony.*

*P. D.* How doth he prove that?

*R. P.* From Dr. *Heylin*, whoſe *Hiſtorics* ſerve us to many a good Purpoſe; for he ſaith, *He was a Calvinian, though a moderate one; that he was an Enemy to Biſhop* Laud *in the Univerſity; that he commends Mr.* Perkins, *and wrote his laſt Book of Grace and Perſeverance of the Saints.*

*P. D.* Very wonderful Proofs! As though many of the ſtiffeſt *Defenders* of our *Church* againſt the *Puritan Party*, had not been inclining to *Calviniſm* (as it is called) *in the Point of Predeſtination*; eſpecially in that moderate way, wherein *R. Abbot* aſſerted it! As though it were not poſſible, for Men to be zealous for our *Liturgy* and *Ceremonies*, if they held the Doctrine of *Election* and *Perſeverance*! But we do not want thoſe of the *Higheſt Order* of our *Church* at this Day, who are eminent for *Learning*, and *Piety*, and *Zeal* for the Church; who would take it very ill from *T. G.* upon the Account of thoſe Opinions, to be thought *Enemies* to the *Church* of *England*; as no doubt the *Puritans* were. But *T. G.* runs on with this perpetual Miſtake; when his own Author Dr. *Heylin* hath told him whom he means by *Puritans*, viz. *the Nonconformiſts*; for ſpeaking of Dr. *Buckeridge*, Biſhop *Laud*'s Tutor, he ſaith, *That he oppoſed the Papiſts on One Hand, and on the Other the Puritans, or Non-conformiſts.* Theſe are very pitiful Shifts to overthrow *Biſhop* Abbot's *Teſtimony*, when Dr. *Heylin* himſelf ſaith of him, *He was ſo moderate a Calvinian, that he incurred the high Diſpleaſure of the Supralapſarians, who had till then carried all before them.* But what ſaith *T. G.* to thoſe whom he yields not to have been *Puritanically inclined*, and yet charged the *Church* of *Rome* with *Idolatry*?

*Cypr. Angl.* *p.* 48 1 *ed.*

*P.* 66.

*R. P.* He ſaith, *They do not impugn the Doctrine it ſelf of the Church of* Rome, *or the Practice conformable to that Doctrine, but ſuch things as they conceived to be great Abuſes in the Practice of it.*

*P. D.* That will be beſt tryed by Particulars; the *Firſt* of theſe is no leſs a *Perſon* than K. *James*, who calls *the Worſhip of Images, Damnable Idolatry*; and Dr. *St.* ſhews *that K.* James *takes off their Diſtinctions and Evaſions*, and ſaith, *Let them therefore that maintain this Doctrine anſwer it to Chriſt at the latter Day, when he ſhall accuſe them of Idolatry. And then I doubt if he will be paid with ſuch Sophiſtical Diſtinctions. Is all this,* ſaith Dr. *St. nothing but to charge them with ſuch Practices which they deteſt? Doth he not mention their Doctrine, and their Diſtinctions? Did not K.* James *underſtand what he ſaid, and what they did?* What ſaith *T. G.* to this?

*R. P.* Not a *Word* that I can find.

*P. D.* Let us then ſee what he doth take Notice of.

*R. P.* A very notable thing I aſſure you. He ſaith, *They only found Fault with ſome Abuſes committed in our Church, and did not think Men by vertue of the Terms of her Communion forced either to Hypocriſy or Idolatry*, as Dr. *St.* doth; *ſo that it is not the Doctrine of the Church of* Rome, *if truly ſtated out of the Decrees of her Councils, or Practice agreeable to that Doctrine,*

*Dial. p.* 30. *to* 38.

*Doctrine, which these Divines impeach as Idolatrous ; but the Opinions of some School-Divines, or Abuses they conceived to be committed in the Practice of it. And for this he instanceth in the Decree of the Council of* Nice *about the Worship of Images.*

*P. D.* Who doth not know *T. G.* to be a Man of Art ? and to understand the way of fencing in the *Schools* as well as another ? Was it not skilfully done in this Place to run to the *Point of Images*, when we had been so lately upon the *Idolatry* in *Adoration of the Host*, as it is declared in our *Rubrick?* For the *Constitution* of the *Church* of *Rome* is plain to all Persons about *Adoration* of the *Host*, at the *Elevation* of it, and *carrying it about* ; but in the Matter of *Images* they endeavour to *palliate* and *disguise* their allowed *Practices* as much as may be. I answer therefore on behalf of Dr. *St.* (1.) That when he speaks of what Men are obliged to do *by vertue of Communion with the Church of* Rome, he speaks of the things *strictly required* by the *Rules* of *that Church* ; and since our *Church* declares *the Mass Idolatrous*, he doth not in the least recede from the Sense of our *Church* in the Disjunction he useth, either of *Hypocrisy*, or *Idolatry* ; and I have some Reason to believe that was the thing he aimed at chiefly, when he spoke of *the Terms of Communion* ; because he had often heard of some Persons who live in the *Communion* of that *Church*, who being not obliged to make the same *Professions* which *Ecclesiastical Persons* are, do content themselves with doing the *same external Acts* which others do ; but with a *very different Intention* ; who look upon *Transubstantiation*, and many other Doctrines as *fooliſh* and *ridiculous* ; and yet think they may join with those who do believe them in all *external Acts of Worship*, rather than break the Peace of the Church they live in : Such Persons would say, they *never worshipped the Host*, and therefore excuse themselves from *Idolatry* ; but Dr. *St.* saith, *they cannot then excuse themselves from Hypocrisy*, because they seem to give the *same Worship* which the other doth. (2.) As to the *Idolatry* committed in the *Worship of Images*, we shall consider that in its proper Place ; but yet by vertue of Communion with the *Church* of *Rome*, all Persons are (1.) bound to declare the *Worship* of *Images* lawful as it is practised in that *Church*. (2.) To *worship Images* upon occasion offered, as in *Processions*, &c. (3.) To *worship* the *Cross* as it *represents Christ*, with that *Worship* which is proper to his *Person*. That which concerns us now, is to give an account of the Judgment of these *Persons*, how far they suppose the *Church* of *Rome* to be guilty of the *Idolatry* committed in it. As to K. *James*, we have seen already how far *T. G.* is from answering his Testimony ; the next is *Isaac Casaubon*, and he saith, *The Church of* England *did affirm the Practices of the Church of* Rome *to be joyned with great Impiety*. So that he speaks the Sense of *our Church*, and not barely his *own* ; and surely when he wrote by King *James* his Direction and Order, and had so great Intimacy with Bishop *Andrews*, and other learned Men of our *Church*, he would declare nothing to be her *Sense* which was contrary to it. And as to his own private Opinion, I could tell *T. G.* somewhat more, *viz.* that when he was violently set upon by all the Wit and Industry of *Card. Perron*, and disobliged by some Persons of his own *Communion* at *Paris*, he set himself seriously to consider the *Terms* of *Communion* in that *Church*, and whether he might with a safe Conscience embrace it ; and I have seen in his own *Hand-Writing* the Reasons which hindred him from it ; and the first of them was the *Fear of Idolatry, which he saw practised in the Worship of Images and Saints.*

Which is as full a Proof as may be, that he did not think any Perſon could embrace the Communion of that *Church* without *Hypocriſy* or *Idolatry* as to the Worſhip of *Images* and *Saints*. The Third is Biſhop *Andrews*, who not only charges the *Church* of *Rome* with *Idolatry* ; but he ſaith, *That in their Breviaries, Hours, and Roſaries, they pray directly, abſolutely and finally to Saints ; and not merely to the Saints to pray to God for them, but give what they pray for themſelves* : To this *T. G.* ſaith, *they profeſs they do no ſuch thing* ; as though we were enquiring what they profeſſed, and not what Biſhop *Andrews* charged them with. If *Idolatry*, according to Biſhop *Andrews*, be required in the *Authorized Offices* of *Devotion* in their *Church*, how can the Members of it be excuſed either from *Hypocriſy* or *Idolatry* ? The Fourth is Dr. *Field*, who chargeth the *Invocation of Saints* with *ſuch Superſtition and Idolatry as cannot be excuſed* : The Fifth Dr. *Jackſon*, who ſaith *the Papiſts give Divine Honour to Images*. The Sixth Archbiſhop *Laud*, who not only affirms the *Modern Church of* Rome *to be too like to Paganiſm in the Adoration of Images*, but condemns *the praying to Angels as the Idolatry condemned by the Council of* Laodicea ; as Dr. *St.* ſhewed from his *MS. Notes* upon *Bellarmine*. To theſe Dr. *St.* added in his *General Preface*, the *Teſtimonies* of Archbiſhop *Bancroft*, Biſhop *Montague*, *Pet. Heylin*, and Mr. *Thorndike* ; which Three laſt were the very *Perſons T.G.* did appeal to ; and the *Laſt* of them did declare, *That the Practice of Idolatry was ſuch in the* Roman *Church, that no good Chriſtian dare truſt his Soul in the Communion of it* ; which is all one as to ſay, they muſt be guilty of *Hypocriſy* or *Idolatry*.

*R.P.* But *T.G.* ſaith, *They only reprove ſome Practices as Idolatrous, or at leaſt in danger to be ſuch ; but Dr.* St. *acknowledges that they excuſe the Church of* Rome *from Idolatry although not all who live in the Communion of it.*

*P. D.* Doth he indeed ſay ſo ? or is this another Piece of *T. G.*'s *Fineneſs* ? His Words are theſe : *And although it may be only an Exceſs of Charity in ſome few learned Perſons to excuſe that Church from Idolatry, although not all who live in the Communion of it* : And then produces the Seventeen Teſtimonies to ſhew he did not differ from the *Senſe* of the *Church* of *England*, or the eminent Defenders of it ever ſince the Reformation ; and do you think that among his *Teſtimonies*, he would produce any, whom he thought to *free the Church of* Rome *from Idolatry* ? no certainly ; but I ſuppoſe that Clauſe referred to Mr. *Thorndike* and ſome few others ; and as to Mr. *Thorndike*, he afterwards produced the Paſſage before-mentioned out of ſome *Papers* written by him a little before his Death. What ſaith *T. G.* to that ?

*R. P.* Not a Word more; but I find he makes uſe of Mr. *Thorndike*'s Name on all *Occaſions*, as if he favoured our ſide againſt the *Church* of *England*, and Dr. *St.* And the Man who manageth the *Dialogue* againſt him, is brought in as one of Mr. *Thorndike*'s Principles. I pray tell me was not he a Man in his *Heart* of our *Church*, and only lived in the *external Communion* of *Your's*.

*P. D.* Dr. *St.* hath given a juſt Character of him, when he calls him a *Man of excellent Learning and great Piety* ; and ſince ſo ill Uſe is made of his Name in theſe Diſputes, and ſuch Diſhonour done to his Memory, I ſhall but do him right, to let you underſtand what his Judgment was of the *Church* of *Rome* : Which he delivered in a Paper to a *Lady* a little before his Death, from whom it came immediately to my *Hands*, and is the ſame Paper Dr. *St.* doth refer to.

1. The

1. The Truth of the Christian Religion, and of the Scripture is presupposed to the Being of a Church.

And therefore cannot depend upon the Authority of it.

2. The *Church* of *Rome* maintains the Decrees of the present Church to be Infallible, which is false; and yet concerns the Salvation of all that believe it;

Therefore no Man can submit to the Authority of it.

3. The *Church* of *Rome* in St. *Jerom*'s time, did not make void the Baptism of those Sects which did not baptize in the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost;

But that *Baptism* is void, and true Baptism necessary to Salvation.

Therefore the *Church* of *Rome* may err in Matters of Salvation.

4. The *Church* of *Rome* may err in *Schism*, following the wrong Cause. If you except only things necessary to Salvation to be believed. This shews that Infallibility only in things necessary to Salvation is not enough. It is destructive to Salvation to follow the wrong Cause in Schism.

Instance. The Schism with the *Greek Church* for Appeals to *Rome*. For there is evident Tradition to the contrary.

5. The *Church* of *Rome* enjoins *Apocryphal Scriptures* to be esteemed *Canonical Scriptures*.

But this Injunction is contrary to *Tradition* and Truth, and concerns the Salvation of all that receive it.

6. The *Church* of *Rome* in St. *Jerom*'s time did not receive the *Epistle* to the *Hebrews* for *Canonical Scripture*, as now it doth, and as in truth it is;

Therefore the *Church* of *Rome* may err in declaring the Authority of Scripture.

7. The *Church* of *Rome* doth err in teaching, that Attrition is turned into Contrition by submitting to the Power of the Keys;

But this Error is destructive to the Salvation of all that believe it.

Therefore it may err in Matters necessary to Salvation.

That it is an Error. Because of the Condition of Remission of Sins, which is Before the Being of a Church; and therefore cannot depend on the Authority of the Church.

8. The *Church* of *Rome* enjoineth to believe *Transubstantiation*, and to profess that which is false. For there is Scripture and Tradition for the Presence of the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ* in the *Eucharist*; but neither *Scripture*, nor *Tradition* for *Transubstantiation*, viz. for abolishing the *Elements*;

But the *Church* of *Rome* enjoins to believe it.

Therefore it enjoins to believe that for which there is neither *Tradition* nor *Scripture*. Witness the *Fathers* that own the Elements after Consecration.

9. The *Council* of *Trent* enjoineth to believe, that *Christ* instituted a new *Passover* to be sacrificed as well as represented, commemorated, and offered in the Eucharist, *de Sacrific. Missæ, cap.* 1. which is false;

For the *Sacrifice* of *Christ's Cross* is commemorated, represented and offered as ready to be slain in and by the *Eucharist*; but not slain, and therefore not sacrificed in it, and by celebrating it.

And

And therefore when it is ſaid there, c. 11. *quod in Miſſa Chriſtus incruentè immolatur*, if it be meant *properly*, it is a *Contradiction*; for that which hath Blood is not ſacrificed, but by ſhedding the Blood of it; if *figuratively*, it ſignifies no more than that which I have ſaid, that it is repreſented, commemorated and offered as ſlain.

And therefore all Parts agreeing to this, the *Church* of *Rome* requiring more is guilty of the *Schiſm* that comes by refuſing it. For the Propitiation of the Sacrifice of the Euchariſt is the Propitiation of Chriſt's Croſs purchaſed for them that are qualify'd.

10. The *Council* of *Trent* commends the Maſs without the Communion, *cap. 6.*; wherein it erreth;

For the Communion being the reſtoring of the Covenant of Baptiſm after Sin, the Want of it without the Deſire of it, is to be lamented not commended, as deſtructive of the Means of Salvation.

11. There is neither Scripture nor Tradition for praying to Saints departed, or any Evidence that they hear our Prayers.

Therefore it evidences a Carnal Hope, that God will abate of the Covenant of our Baptiſm, which is the Condition of our Salvation, for their Sakes.

12. To pray to them for thoſe things which only God can give (as all Papiſts do) is by the proper Senſe of their Words downright Idolatry.

If they ſay their meaning is by a Figure only to deſire them to procure their Requeſts of God; How dare any Chriſtian truſt his Soul with that Church, which teaches that which muſt needs be Idolatry in all that underſtand not the Figure?

13. There is neither Scripture nor Tradition for worſhipping the *Croſs*, the *Images*, and *Reliques* of *Saints*;

Therefore it evidences the ſame Carnal Hope, that God will abate of his Goſpel for ſuch Bribes. Which is the Will-worſhip of *Maſſes*, *Pilgrimages*, and *Indulgences* to that Purpoſe.

14. Neither *Scripture* nor *Tradition* is there for the removing any Soul out of *Purgatory* unto the *Beatifical Viſion* before the Day of *Judgment*;

Therefore the ſame Carnal Hope is ſeen in the Will-worſhip of Maſſes, Indulgences, Pilgrimages and the like for that Purpoſe: And that deſtructive to the Salvation of all that believe that the guilt of their Sins is taken away by ſubmitting to the *Keys* before they be contrite; and the Temporal Penalty remaining in *Purgatory* paid by theſe *Will-worſhips*.

15. Both *Scripture* and *Tradition* condemn the *Depoſing of Princes*, and acquitting their Subjects of their *Allegiance*, and enjoyning them to take *Arms* for them whom the *Pope* ſubſtitutes.

And this Doctrine is not only falſe, but in my Opinion properly *Hereſy*; yet practiſed by ſo many *Popes*.

The Church may be divided, that *Salvation* may be had on both ſides. Inſtances. The *Schiſms* of the *Popes*. The *Schiſm* of *Acacius*. The *Schiſm* between the *Greeks* and the *Latins*.

I hold the *Schiſm* for the *Reformation* to be of this kind.

But I do not allow *Salvation* to any that ſhall change, having theſe Reaſons before him; tho' I allow the *Reformation* not to be perfect in ſome Points of leſs moment, as *Prayer for the dead*, and others.

Remember always that the *Popiſh Church* of *England* can never be Canonically governed being immediately under the Pope. 16. There

16. There is both *Scripture* and *Tradition* for the *Scriptures* and *Service* in a *known Tongue*; and for the *Euchariſt* in both *Kinds*.

How then can any Chriſtian truſt his Soul with that *Church*, which hath the Conſcience to bar him of ſuch Helps provided by God?

Theſe are all his own Words without Addition or Alteration. And what think you now of Mr. *Thorndike*? Was this Man a ſecret Friend to the *Church* of *Rome* do you think? Who ſaith ſo plainly, that a Man cannot embrace the Communion of that *Church* without Hazard of his *Salvation*.

*R. P.* I did little think by the Uſe *T. G.* on all Occaſions makes of him, that he had been a Man of ſuch *Principles*. But I think *T. G.* had as good have let him alone, as have given Occaſion for producing ſuch *Teſtimonies* of the Thoughts which a Man of his *Learning* and *Fame* had, concerning the *Church* of *Rome*. However, you ſee, *he holds the Preſence of the Body and Blood of Chriſt in the Euchariſt*; and can you reconcile this, to what you aſſerted to be the *Doctrine* of the *Church* of *England*?

*P. D.* Yes, very well. If you compare what he ſaith here, with what he declares more at large in his Book, wherein you may read theſe remarkable Words to this Purpoſe. *If it can any way be ſhewed, that the Church did ever pray that the Fleſh and Blood might be ſubſtituted inſtead of the Elements under the Accidents of them, then I am content that this be accounted henceforth the Sacramental Preſence of them in the Euchariſt. But if the Church only pray, that the Spirit of God, coming down upon the Elements, may make them the Body and Blood of Chriſt, ſo that they which receive them may be filled with the Grace of his Spirit; then is it not the Senſe of the Catholick Church, that can oblige any Man to believe the aboliſhing of the Elements in their Bodily Subſtance; becauſe ſuppoſing that they remain, they may nevertheleſs come to be the Inſtrument of God's Spirit to convey the Operation thereof to them that are diſpoſed to receive it, no otherwiſe than his Fleſh and Blood conveyed the Efficacy thereof upon Earth: And that I ſuppoſe is Reaſon enough to call it the Body and Blood of Chriſt Sacramentally, that is to ſay as in the Sacrament of the Euchariſt.* And in two or three Places more he ſpeaks to the ſame Purpoſe. Laws of the Ch. Ch. 4. p. 30.

*R. P.* Hold, Sir, I beſeech you; you have ſaid enough; you will fall back again to *Tranſubſtantiation* in ſpite of my Heart.

*P. D.* What? When I only anſwer a Queſtion you asked me?

*R. P.* Enough of Mr. *Thorndike*; unleſs he were more our Friend, than I find he was. I pray what ſay you to Archbiſhop *Whitgift*?

*P. D.* Hath *T. G.* perſuaded you, *that he is turned Puritan*, above Seventy Years after his Death, who never was ſuſpected for it while he was living, nor ſince, till the transforming Days of *T. G.*?

*R. P.* You may jeer as you pleaſe; but *T. G.* tells a notable Story of the *Lambeth Articles*, and how Q. *Elizabeth's Black Husband* was like to have been divorced from her upon them, and how K. *James* would not receive them into the *Articles* of the *Church*. And all this, as well as many other good things, he hath out of one *P. Heylin*. Is the Man alive, I pray, that we may give him our due thanks for the Service he hath done us upon many Occaſions? For we have written whole *Books* againſt the *Reformation*, out of his *Hiſtory* of it; and I find *T. G.* relies as much upon him as other *good Catholicks* do on *Cochlæus*, and *Surius*; or as he doth at other times on the *Patronus bonæ Fidei*. Dial. p. 42. &c.

*P. D.* Dr.

*P. D.* Dr. *Heylin* was a Man of very good Parts and Learning, and who did write Hiſtory pleaſantly enough; but in ſome things he was too much a *Party* to be an *Hiſtorian*; and being deeply concerned in ſome Quarrels himſelf, all his Hiſtorical Writings about our *Church* do plainly diſcover which ſide he eſpouſed: Which to me doth not ſeem to agree with the Impartiality of an *Hiſtorian*. And if he could but throw Dirt on that which he accounted the *Puritan Party*, from the *Beginning* of the *Reformation*, he matter'd not though the whole *Reformation* ſuffered by it. But for all this he was far from being a Friend either to the *Church* or *Court* of *Rome*; and next to *Puritaniſm*, I believe he hated *Popery* moſt; ſo that if he had been alive, and you had gone to thank him for the Service he had done you, in all probability you had provoked him to have written as ſharply againſt you as ever he wrote againſt the *Puritans*. But what is all this to *Archbiſhop* Whitgift's *being ſuſpected for a Puritan*? Dares *P. Heylin* ſuggeſt any ſuch thing? No, he knew him too well: And ſaith, *That by his Contrivance the Puritan Faction was ſo muzzled that they were not able to bark in a long time after.* Had he then any Suſpicion of his being *Puritanically inclined*? And as to the *Lambeth Articles*, they only prove that he held thoſe Opinions contained in them, and recommended them to the *Univerſity* to *ſuppreſs the Diſputes* which had been there raiſed concerning them. And what then? doth this render him ſuſpected for a *Puritan* at that time? When many of the greateſt *Anti-Puritans* were zealous Defenders of thoſe Opinions. In all Q. *Elizabeth*'s time and after, the Name of *Puritans*, ſignified *the Oppoſers of our Government, and the Service and Orders of our Church*; and ſome have undertaken to name the Perſon, who firſt applyed this Name to the *Aſſertors* of theſe *Doctrinal Points*, towards the latter End of K. *James*. This is certain, (which is moſt material to our Purpoſe) that when K. *Charles* I. publiſh'd his *Declaration* to prevent unneceſſary *Diſputations* about theſe Points, he ſaith, *That they did all agree in the true uſual literal Meaning of the ſaid Articles of our Church; and that even in thoſe curious Points in which the preſent Differences lye, Men of all Sorts take the Articles of the Church of* England *to be for them; which is an Argument again, none of them intend any Deſertion of the Articles eſtabliſhed.* And which is a certain Argument, that even at that time no Man was charged with Diſaffection to the *Church* of *England* meerly on the Account of theſe *Doctrinal Points*.

*Cypr. Angl.* p. 62.

*Cypr. Angl.* p. 189.

*R. P.* But what was it which Archbiſhop *Whitgift* ſaith; for *T. G.* ſaith, even that will involve him more in the *Suſpicion* of *Puritaniſm*.

*P. D.* His Words are theſe, *I do as much miſlike the Diſtinction of the Papiſts, and the Intent of it, as any Man doth; neither do I go about to excuſe them from wicked and (without Repentance, and God's ſingular Mercy,) damnable Idolatry.* This is enough to Dr. *St.*'s Purpoſe; and afterwards he ſaith, *He placeth the Papiſts among wicked and damnable Idolaters.* Is not this Home, do you think?

*R. P.* But doth not he ſay, *That one kind of Idolatry is, when the true God is worſhipped by other Means and Ways than he hath preſcribed or would be worſhipped*? And according to Dr. *St. this is the Fundamental Principle of thoſe who ſeparate from the Church of* England, *that nothing is lawful in the Worſhip of God, but what he hath expreſly commanded*: Therefore according to Dr. *St.* himſelf, *Archbiſhop* Whitgift *was a Puritan*.

*Dial. p. 46, 47. &c.*

*P. D.* It is notably argued, I confeſs; and thence it follows, if Archbiſhop *Whitgift* had underſtood the Force of his own Principle, he muſt have

have ſeparated from the *Church* of *England*. But is it not plain to the common Senſe of any Man that Archbiſhop *Whitgift* writing on behalf of our *Ceremonies*, and againſt this very Principle in *T. G.*, his Words could not bear that meaning; and therefore Dr. *St.* had great Reaſon to ſay, that his meaning in thoſe Words was, *againſt his expreſs Command*, as appears by the Application of them? So that either you muſt make Archbiſhop *Whitgift* ſo weak a Man as to overthrow the Deſign of his *whole Book*, or this muſt be his *meaning* which Dr. *St.* aſſigns.

*R. P.* But Dr. *St.* himſelf makes the charging *Papiſts* to be *Idolaters*, *a diſtinctive Sign of Puritaniſm.* Dial. p. 47.

*P. D.* Are you in earneſt? I pray, when and where? For then I am ſure he contradicts himſelf; for his Deſign is to prove juſt the contrary. Name me the Page, I beſeech you, that I may judge of it.

*R. P.* Why, doth he not ſay, *That it is the Fundamental Principle of Puritaniſm, that nothing is lawful in the Worſhip of God, but what he hath expreſly commanded?*

*P. D.* And what then?

*R. P.* Then——Hold a little—then—it will not do.

*P. D.* I think not, truly. If this be the Fundamental Principle of *Puritans*, *That nothing is lawful in the Worſhip of God*, *but what is commanded*; *then to charge the Church of* Rome *with Idolatry is a diſtinctive Sign of Puritaniſm.* How many Cords are neceſſary to tye theſe Two together? (1.) Can no one Charge the *Papiſts* with *Idolatry*, but by vertue of this Principle? I do hold, whatever *God* hath not forbidden, to be lawful in his *Worſhip*; but may not I at the ſame time, hold ſome kind of prohibited *Worſhip* to be *Idolatry*? I can hardly imagine a Man of *T. G.*'s Subtilty could write thus. But that you have the Book by you, and tell me ſo, I could not have believed it. (2.) Thoſe who do hold this Principle, do not preſently make every thing *unlawful* to be an *Idol* by vertue of it. For they do not deduce this Unlawfulneſs from the *Prohibition* of *Idolatry*, but from the *Perfection* and *Sufficiency* of the *Scriptures* as a *Rule* of *Worſhip*, and they ſay, *we muſt not add thereto*; and therefore no Human Invention muſt be uſed in the *Worſhip* of *God*. Now judge you whether, according to this Principle, there can be nothing *unlawful*, but it muſt be an *Idol*?

*R. P.* This was an Overſight, I ſuppoſe, in him: Let it paſs. But what makes Dr. *St.* vary ſo much from his old Principle in his *Irenicum*, wherein he aſſerted, *That nothing is lawful in the immediate Worſhip of God, but what is commanded; this muſt come either from a greater Light of the Spirit, or from the weighty Conſiderations mentioned by the Patronus bonæ Fidei*, when he ſaith, *Quicquid Cl. Stillingfleet delinitus & occæcatus opimitate & obeſitate ſuorum ſacerdotiorum, &c.* Dial. p. 49. Prodr. p. 76.

*P. D.* For the malicious ſuggeſtions of ſo wretched a Calumniator, as the *Patronus bonæ Fidei* appears to be throughout that Book, they are not worth taking Notice of by any one that doth not ſearch for *Dunghils*. It is Dr. *St.*'s Honour to be reproached by a Man who hath made it his Buſineſs to reproach the beſt *Church* in *Chriſtendom*, and to undermine all *Churches*, above Thirty Years; and yet the ungrateful Creature hath in ſome Meaſure lived upon the Revenues of that *Church* himſelf, which he hath ſo ſhamefully reviled; being in great Part ſupported by the *Bounty* of a very worthy and learned *Church-Man*, who is nearly related to him. But as to the Contradiction charged on Dr. *St.* I begin to ſuſpect *T. G.* more than ever I did. For doth not Dr. *St.* in that Place di-

ſtinguiſh between *immediate Acts* and *Parts* of *Worſhip*, and *Circumſtances belonging to thoſe Acts*, even in the very Words alledged by *T. G.*? And doth not he ſay expreſly, That he doth not ſpeak of *theſe*, but of the *former*? And is not the very ſame Diſtinction uſed by Biſhop *Andrews*, Biſhop *Sanderſon*, and the moſt zealous Defenders of the *Rites* of our *Church*? Why then muſt he be ſuppoſed to have changed his Mind as to this Principle, when he ſaid no more at that time, than what the moſt genuine Sons of our *Church* have aſſerted, among whom I do not queſtion Biſhop *Andrews* and Biſhop *Sanderſon* will be allowed to paſs. And they diſtinguiſh after the ſame manner, between the *neceſſary Parts of Worſhip*, for which they ſuppoſe a *Command neceſſary*, as well as Dr. *St.*; and the *Accidental* and *mutable Circumſtances* attending the ſame for Order, Comelineſs, and Edifications Sake, which are lawful, if not contrary to God's Command. And doth not Dr. *St.* ſay the very ſame thing? *viz. That in Matters of meer Decency and Order in the Church of God, it is enough to make things lawful if they are not forbidden.* Let us now compare this Saying with what he calls the Fundamental Principle of Separation; *That nothing is lawful in the Worſhip of God, but what he hath expreſly commanded*: And can any thing be more *contradictory to this*, than what Dr. *St.* lays down as a *Principle* in that very Page of his *Irenicum*? *That an expreſs and poſitive Command is not neceſſary to make a thing lawful; but a Non-prohibition by a Law is ſufficient for that.* Where then lay *T. G.*'s Underſtanding or Ingenuity, when he mentions ſuch a great Change in the Dr. as to this Principle, when he owned the very ſame Principle, even in that *Book*, and that very Page he quotes to the contrary? *T. G.* doth preſume good Catholick Readers will take his Word without looking farther: And I ſcarce ever knew a Writer who ſtands more in need of the good Opinion of his Reader in this kind, than *T. G.* doth. As I ſhall make it fully appear, if you hold on this Diſcourſe with me; for I have taken ſome Pains to conſider *T. G.*'s Manner of dealing with his Adverſary. But this is too groſs a way of impoſing upon the Credulity of Readers; yet this is their common Method of dealing with Dr. *St.* When they intend to write againſt him then, *have you Dr. St.'s Irenicum?* Hoping to find Matter there to expoſe him to the hatred of the *Biſhops*; and to repreſent him as unfit to defend the *Church* of *England*. If this takes not, then they pick Sentences and Half-Sentences from the Series of the Diſcourſe, and laying theſe together, cry, *Look ye here, is this a Man fit to defend your Church, that ſo contradicts himſelf thus, and thus?* When any common Underſtanding by comparing the Places, will find them either falſly repreſented, or eaſily reconciled. In truth, Sir, I think you have ſhewed as little Learning, or Skill, or Ingenuity in anſwering him, as any One *Adverſary* that ever appeared againſt your Church: and eſpecially, when *T. G.* goes about to prove that he contradicts himſelf, or the *Senſe* of the *Church* of *England*.

B. *Andrews Reſp. ad Apolog. Bell.* p. 37. compared with *Burhil. Defenſ. Reſponſ. ad Apolog. c.* 6. *q.* 21. B. *Sanderſ.* Preface to his Serm. §. 15. *De obligat. conſ. præl.* 4. Sect. 33.

*R. P.* But I pray tell me, if this Charge of Idolatry were agreeable to the Senſe of the *Church* of *England*, *why the Articles of the Church do only reject the* Romiſh *Doctrine concerning Worſhipping and Adoration of Images, not as Idolatry, but as a fond thing vainly invented and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God*? For, I perceive this ſticks much with *T. G.* and from hence he concludes Dr. *St.* to contradict the *Senſe* of it, who is the *Champion* of the *Church* of *England*.

*Dial.* p. 51. &c.

P. 62.

*P. D.*

*P. D.* I perceive *T. G.* kept this for a *parting Blow*, after which he thought fit to breathe a while, having ſpent ſo many Spirits in this Encounter; but methinks his Arm grows feeble, and although his Fury be as great as ever, yet his Strength is decayed. And in my mind it doth not become a Man of his *Chivalry*, ſo often to leave his *Lance*, and to run with open Mouth upon his *Adverſary*, and to *bite* till his *Teeth* meet. For what mean the unhandſome Reflections he makes on all occaſions, upon his being *the Champion of the Church of* England; and the *Church of* England's *having cauſe to be aſhamed of ſuch a Champion*; and *of his putting him in mind of his Duty as the Champion of the Church, not to betray the Church he pretends to defend*? Where doth he ever *aſſume* any ſuch *Title* to himſelf? or ever entred the Liſts, but on the account of *Obedience*, or upon great *Provocation*? The Name of *Champion* ſavours too much of *Vanity* and *Oſtentation*; whereas he only ſhewed how eaſily the *Cauſe* could be defended, when his *Superiors* firſt commanded ſuch a *Stripling* as he then was, to undertake the *Defence* of it. But I ſhall ſet aſide theſe Reflections, and come to the Point of our Articles; and therein conſider, 1. What *T. G.* objects. 2. What Dr. *St.* anſwered. 3. Which way the Senſe of the *Articles* is to be interpreted. *T. G.* looks upon it as a notable Obſervation, That the *Compilers of the* XXXIX *Articles* (*in which is contained the Doctrine of the Church of* England) *ſufficiently inſinuate, that they could find no ſuch Command forbidding the Worſhip of Images, when they rejected the Adoration of Images, not as Idolatry, but only as a fond thing vainly invented, nor as repugnant to the plain Words of Scripture, but as rather repugnant to the Word of God; which Qualification of theirs, gives us plainly to underſtand, that they had done their Endeavours to find ſuch a Command, but could meet with none.* To which Dr. *St.* gives this Anſwer, that the Force of all he ſaith, lies upon the Words of the *Engliſh Tranſlation*; whereas if he had looked on the *Latin*, wherein they give account of their Doctrine to Foreign *Churches*, this *Criticiſm* had been loſt; the Words being *immo verbo Dei contradicit*; whereby it appears that *rather* is not uſed as a *Term of Diminution*, but of a more vehement Affirmation. And what ſaith *T. G.* I pray, to this?

Dial. p. 52. P. 150. P. 162.

*R. P. T. G.* repeats his own Words at large, and then blames *the Compilers of the Articles for want of Grammar, if they intend the Word* rather *to affect the Words that follow.*

Dial. p. 59. 60, 61.

*P. D.* But what is all this to the *Latin Articles* which Dr. *St.* appealed to, for Explication of the *Engliſh*? And for the Love of *Grammar*, let *T. G.* tell us whether there be not a more vehement Affirmation in thoſe Words, *immo verbo Dei contradicit.* Either *T. G.* ſhould never have mentioned this more, or have ſaid ſomething more to the Purpoſe. For doth he think our *Biſhops* and *Clergy* were not careful that their true Senſe were ſet forth in the *Latin Articles*? And their Senſe being ſo peremptory herein, and contrary to *T. G.* is there not all the Reaſon in the World to explain the *Engliſh Articles* by the *Latin*, ſince we are ſure they had not Two Meanings? This is ſo plain, I am aſhamed to ſay a Word more to it.

*R. P.* But *T. G.* is very pleaſant in deſcribing the Arguments Dr. *St.* brings to prove the *Articles* to *make the Worſhip of Images Idolatry*, becauſe it is called *Adoration of Images*; and ſaid to be the *Romiſh Doctrine about Adoration.* But after the Cat hath play'd with the *Mouſe* as long as he thinks fit, leaping and friſking with him in his

*Claws*, at last he falls on him with his *Teeth*, and hardly leaves a Bone behind him. After he hath *muster'd* his *Arguments*, and drawn them out in *Rank* and *File*, and made one *Charge* upon another; for the Pleasure of the Reader, he then gives him a plain and solid Answer; Viz. *By the Words* Romish *Doctrine concerning Adoration of Images, may be understood, either the Doctrine taught in her Schools, which being but the Opinions of particular Persons, no Man is bound to follow; or the Doctrine taught in her Councils, which all those of her Communion are bound to submit to. If the Doctrine which the Church of* England *chargeth, be that which is taught by some of her School-Divines (which he takes to be her true meaning) this is also denied (at least by those very Divines who teach it) to be Idolatry. If by the* Romish *Doctrine be meant the Doctrine of Councils owned by the Church of* Rome *concerning Worshipping and Adoration of Images, then herein she is vindicated from Idolatry by Eminent Divines that have been esteemed True and Genuine Sons of the Church of* England.

Dial. p 53, 54.

P. 56.

*P. D.* And doth this mighty Effort come to this at last? What pity it is *T. G.* had no better a *Cause*, he sets this off so prettily? and dazzles the Eyes of his Beholders with the Dust he raises, so that those who do not narrowly look into his Feats of Activity, would imagine him still standing, when he is only endeavouring to recover a Fall. For 1. By *Adoration* of *Images*, our Church doth not mean that which their *School-Divines* call *Adoration of Images*, as they distinguish it from *Veneration* of them, but it means all that *Religious Worship* which by the *allowed Doctrine and Practice of the* Roman *Church* is given to *Images*. And this is just the Case of the *Council* of *Franckford*, (concerning which I hear *T. G.* saith not one Word in his last Book, and I commend him for it) the *Western Bishops* condemn *Adoration of Images: Very true*, saith *T. G.* and his Brethren, *but all this was a bare Mistake of the* Nicene Council, *which never approved* Adoration *of* Images, *but only an* Inferior Worship; but Dr. *St.* hath shewed, that the *Franckford Council* knew of this Distinction well enough, and notwithstanding their denying it, the *Western Church* did judge, that the *Worship* which they gave to *Images* was *really Adoration*, whether they called it so or not. Just so it is with the *Church* of *England*, in reference to the *Church* of *Rome*; this distinguishes *Adoration* from *Inferior Worship*; but our *Church* owns no such *Distinction*, and calls that *Religious Worship* which they give to *Images*, *Adoration*; and supposing it were really so, Dr. *St.* saith, *their own Divines yield it to be Idolatry*; *i. e.* the *Church* of *England* calls their *Worship* of *Images Adoration*, or *giving Divine Worship to a Creature*, but their *Divines* do yield this is *Idolatry*; and therefore the *Church* of *England* doth charge the *Church* of *Rome* with *Idolatry*. But how subtilly had *T. G.* altered the whole Force of the Argument? by taking *Adoration* not in the *Sense* of our *Church*, but of their *School-Divines*; and then telling us, *That even those School-Divines who teach Adoration of Images deny it to be Idolatry*. And who ever expected they should confess themselves guilty? But what is this, to the Sense of the *Church* of *England*? Where doth it allow such a Distinction of *Divine Worship* into that which is *Superior* and *Inferior*, or that which is *proper to God*, and that *which is not*? 2. By *Romish Doctrine* the *Church* of *England* doth not mean the *Doctrine of the School-Divines*; but the *Doctrine received and allowed in that Church* from whence the *Worship* of *Images* is required and practised. Such kind of *Worship* I mean, as is justified and defended in

*common*

*common* among them, without their *School-Distinctions*; *such Worship* as was required here in the *Recantation* of the *Lollards*, as Dr. *St.* observes, *I do swear to God and all his Seynts upon this Holy Gospel, that fro this Day froward I shall worship Images with praying and offering unto them in the Worship of the Seynts that they be made after*; such *Worship* as was required here by the *Constitutions* of *Arundel*, A. D. 1408. *with Processions, Genuflections, Thurifications, Deosculations, Oblations, Burnings of Lights, and Pilgrimages, which are called Acts of Adoration*; and this *Constitution* was a part of the *Canon Law* of *England*, which all Persons were then bound to observe, or else might be proceeded against as *Lollards*. And this is that which Dr. *St.* insists upon, was the thing condemned by the *Articles* of our *Church*, *viz.* the *Worship* of *Images* which was required and practised here in *England*. And what Reason have we to run to *School-Divines* for the Sense of Matters of daily *Practice*, as the *Worship* of *Images* was before the *Reformation*? And so I conclude, if this be all *T. G.* in so long time hath had to say about this Matter, (*viz.* above Four Years since Dr. *St.*'s *General Preface* was Published) he hath very unreasonably charged him with *dissenting* from the *Church* of *England* in this *Charge* of *Idolatry*. Defence, p. 58.

*F. C.* I hope you have done for this Time; and if you catch me again losing so much Time in hearing *Fending* and *Proving* about the *Church* of *England*, I will give you leave to call me *Fanatick*. If you have any thing more of this kind, talk it out your selves if you please. I expected to have had some comfortable Talk with my old Friend about *Liberty* of *Conscience*; and how many precious Hours have you lost about the *Church* of *England*? This will never do our Business. If you please, my good Friend, you and I will meet in private at such a Place To-morrow.

*P. D.* Nay Sir, let me not be excluded your Company, since I am so accidentally fal'n into it; and have but Patience to hear us talk out these Matters, since we have begun them. For I hear your Friend's Friend *T. G.* hath said some things wherein your Cause is concerned.

*F. C.* I do intend for the *Auction* again To-morrow, and if I can easily get the *Books* I look for, I will bear you Company; otherwise go on with your *Discourse*, and I will come to you when I have made my Adventures. It is possible I may meet with some of them to Night; for I hear them at *Rutherford*, and *Gillespee*, and our *Divinity* follows just after the *Scotch*. Which was well observed by the *Catalogue-maker*: For the *Covenant* bound us to *reform* according to the Pattern of the *Church* of *Scotland*.

*R. P.* You intend then to meet here again To-morrow at Three of the Clock, to pursue our *Conferences* about these Matters. I will not fail you; and so adieu.

## *The End of the First Conference.*

THE

THE

# Second Conference,

## *About the Consequences of the Charge of* IDOLATRY.

*P. D.* HOW long have you been at the Auction?

*R. P.* Above an Hour; for I had a great Desire to see how the Books were sold at them.

*P. D.* And I pray what do you observe concerning the buying of Books here?

*R. P.* I find it a pretty humoursome thing: And sometimes Men give greater Rates for Books, than they may buy them for in the Shops; and yet generally, Books are sold dearer here, than in any Part of *Europe*.

*P. D.* What Reason can you give for that?

*R. P.* One is, That the *Scholars* of *England* allow themselves greater Liberty in *Learning*, than they do in foreign Parts, where commonly only One Kind of Learning is in Esteem in a Place; but here a Man that intends a *Library*, buys all Sorts of Books; and that makes your Traders in Books bring over from all Parts, and of all Kinds, and when they have them in their Hands, they make the Buyers pay for their Curiosity. In *Italy* it is a rare thing to meet with a *Greek* Book in the Shops: In *Spain* you see nothing almost besides *Prayer-Books*, *Novels*, and *School-Divinity*. At *Antwerp* and *Lions*, School-Divinity, and Lives of the Saints are most sold. At *Paris* indeed there is greater Variety. But we observe it Abroad, that in the best Catholick Countreys, Learning is in least Esteem; as in *Spain* and *Italy*. And where Learning is more in Vogue, as in *France*, you see how ready they are to quarrel with the Pope, and to fall into Heats and Controversies about Religion. And therefore to deal freely with you, I am not at all pleased to see this Eagerness of buying Books among you. For as long as Learning holds up, we see little Hopes of prevailing, though we and the Fanaticks had *Liberty* of *Conscience*; since upon long Experience we find *Ignorance* and our *Devotion*, to agree as well as *Mother* and *Daughter*.

*P. D.* I am glad of any Symptom that we are like to hold in our Wits; and I think your Observation is true enough. I have only one thing to add to it, which is, That it was not *Luther*, or *Zuinglius* that contributed so much to the Reformation, as *Erasmus*; especially among us in *England*. For *Erasmus* was the Man who awakened Mens Understandings, and brought them from the *Friars Divinity* to a Relish of general Learning: He by his Wit laughed down the imperious Ignorance of the Monks, and made them the Scorn of *Christendom*: And by his Learning he brought most of the *Latin* Fathers to Light, and published them with excellent Editions, and useful Notes; by which Means Men of Parts set themselves to consider the Ancient Church from the Writings of the *Fathers* themselves, and not from the *Canonists* and *School-*

*men.*

*men.* So that moſt learned and impartial Men were prepared for the *Doctrines* of the *Reformation* before it brake forth. For it is a fooliſh thing to imagine that a Quarrel between Two *Monks* at *Wittemberg* ſhould make ſuch an Alteration in the State of *Chriſtendom.* But things had been tending that way a good while before, by the gradual Reſtoration of Learning in theſe Weſtern Parts. The *Greeks* coming into *Italy* after the taking of *Conſtantinople*, and bringing their *Books* with them, laid the Firſt Foundation of it; then ſome of the *Princes* of *Italy* advanced their own Reputation by the Encouragement they gave to it: From thence it ſpread into *Germany*, and there *Reuchlin* and his Companions joyned *Hebrew* with *Greek*; from thence it came into *France* and *England.* When Men had by this Means attained to ſome Skill in Languages, they thought it neceſſary to ſearch the *Old* and *New Teſtament* in their Original Tongues, which they had heard of, but few had ſeen, not above One *Greek Teſtament* being to be found in all *Germany*; then *Eraſmus* prints it with his *Notes*, which infinitely took among all pious and learned Men, and as much enraged the Monks and Friars, and all the faſt Friends to their Dulneſs and Superſtition. When Men had from reading the *Scripture* and *Fathers* formed in their Minds a true Notion of the *Chriſtian Religion* and of the *Government* and *Practices* of the Ancient *Church*, and compared that with what they ſaw in their own Age, they wondred at the Difference, and were aſtoniſhed to think how ſuch an Alteration ſhould happen; but then, they reflected on the *Barbariſm* of the foregoing Ages, the gradual Encroachments of the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, the ſuiting of Doctrines and Practices to carry on a temporal Intereſt, the Compliance with the ſuperſtitious Humours of People, the vaſt Numbers of Monks and Friars, whoſe Intereſt lay in the upholding theſe things, and when they laid theſe things together, they did not wonder at the Degeneracy they ſaw in the Chriſtian Church. All the Difficulty was, how to recover the Church out of this State; and this puzzled the wiſeſt Men among them; ſome thought the ill Humours were grown ſo natural to the Body, that it would hazard the State of it to attempt a ſudden Purging them quite away; and that a violent Reformation would do more Miſchief than Good, by popular Tumults, by Schiſm and Sacriledge; and although ſuch Perſons ſaw the Corruptions, and wiſhed them Reformed; yet conſidering the Hazard of a ſudden Change, they thought it beſt for particular Perſons to inform the World better, and ſo by Degrees bring it about, than to make any violent Diſturbance in the Church. While theſe things were conſidered of by wiſer Men, the *Pope* goes on to abuſe the People with the Trade of *Indulgences*; and his Officers in *Germany* were ſo impudent in this Trade, that a bold Monk at *Wittemberg* defies them, and of a ſudden lays open the Cheat, and this Diſcovery immediately ſpread like Wild-fire; and ſo they went on from one thing to another, till the People were enraged at being ſo long and ſo groſly abuſed and Tyranized over. But when *Reformation* begins below, it is not to be expected that no Diſorders and Heats ſhould happen in the Management of it; which gave Diſlaſtes to ſuch Perſons as *Eraſmus* was, which made him like ſo ill the *Wittemberg Reformation*, and whatever was carried on by popular Tumults. Yet *Roſinus* ſaith, that the *Duke* of *Saxony* before he would declare himſelf in Favour of *Luther*, asked *Eraſmus* his Opinion concerning him; who gave him this Anſwer, *That* Luther *touched upon Two Dangerous Points, the Monks Bellies, and*

*Joh. Roſin. vit. Fred. ſapient.*

*the*

*the Pope's Crown; that his Doctrine was true and certain, but he did not approve the manner of his Writing.* But here in *England*, the Reformation was begun by the Consent of the *King* and the *Bishops*, who yielded to the Retrenchment of the Pope's exorbitant Power, and the taking away some grosser Abuses in *Henry* the VIIIth's Time; but in *Edward* the VIth's Time, and Queen *Elizabeth*'s, when it was settled on the Principles it now stands, there was no such Regard had to *Luther*, or *Calvin*, as to *Erasmus* and *Melancthon*, whose Learning and Moderation were in greater Esteem here, than the Fiery Spirits of the other. From hence, things were carry'd with greater Temper, the Church settled with a Succession of *Bishops*; the *Liturgy* reformed according to the Ancient *Models*; some decent Ceremonies retained, without the Follies and Superstitions which were before practised: And to prevent the Extravagancies of the People in the Interpreting of Scripture, the most excellent *Paraphrase* of *Erasmus* was translated into *English*, and set up in *Churches*; and to this Day, *Erasmus* is in far greater Esteem among the Divines of our *Church*, than either *Luther*, or *Calvin*.

*R. P.* If this be true which you say, methinks your *Divines* should have a Care of Broaching such things, which do *subvert the Foundation of all Ecclesiastical Authority among you*, as *T. G.* told Dr. *St. the Charge of Idolatry* doth. For by vertue of this Charge, he saith, *The Church of* England *remains deprived of the lawful Authority to use and exercise the Power of Orders; and consequently the Authority of Governing, Preaching, and Administring the Sacraments, which those of the Church of* England *challenge to themselves, as derived from the Church of* Rome, *can be no true and lawful Jurisdiction, but usurped and Anti-Christian.* This I assure you, *T. G.* lays great Weight upon in his late *Dialogues*, and charges him *with Ignorance, and Tergiversation*, and other hard Words about it. So that I have a mind to hear what you can say in his Defence about this, before I touch upon the other *Consequences* which he urgeth upon this *Charge* of *Idolatry*.

*Dial p. 141.*

*P. D.* With all my Heart. There are two things wherein the Force of *T. G.*'s Argument lies. (1.) *That which he calls his undeniable Maxim of Reason*, viz. *That no Man can give to another that which he hath not himself.* (2.) *That Idolatry lays Men under the Apostles Excommunication, and therefore are deprived of all lawful Authority to use or exercise the Power of Orders.*

In Answer to these, Two things are already proved by Dr. *St.* (1.) That the Sin of the Givers doth not hinder the *Validity* of *Ordination*. (2.) That the Christian Church hath allowed the *lawful Authority* of *giving* and *exercising* the *Power* of *Orders*, in those who have been condemned for *Idolatry*. Which he proves more briefly in his *Preface*, and at large in his last *Book*, from the Case of the *Arian Bishops*. And now let any one judge whether *T. G.* had any Cause to hector about this Matter for so many *Pages* together, as tho' he had either not understood, or not taken notice of the Force of his Argument. Concerning his undeniable *Maxim* of *Reason* he observed, that it was the very Argument used by the *Donatists* to prove the *Nullity* of *Baptism* among *Hereticks*: And that the Answer given by the Church was, that the *Instrument* was not the *Giver*, but the *First Institutor*; and if the *Minister* keep to the *Institution*, the *Grace* of the *Sacrament* may be conveyed tho' he hath it not himself. This Dr. *St.* thought very pertinent to shew, that where *Power* and *Authority* are *conveyed* by Men only as *Instruments*, the particular Default of such Persons, as *Heresy* or *Idolatry*, do not hinder the Derivation

tion of that *Power* or *Authority* to them. And this he proved to be the Senſe of the *Chriſtian Church* in the *Ordinations* of *Hereticks*. It is true, he did not then ſpeak to *Authority* ſo much as to *Power*; nor to *Juriſdiction*, as it is called by the *School-Divines*, ſo much as to the *Validity* of *Ordination*. But he proceeded upon a *Parity* of *Reaſon* in both Caſes, and could not imagine that any Perſons would ſuppoſe the Chriſtian Church would allow a *Validity* of *Orders*, without *lawful Authority* to uſe and exerciſe thoſe *Orders*. For in all the Inſtances produced by him from the *Second Council* of *Nice*, wherein undeniable Examples were brought of *Ordinations* of *Hereticks* allowed by the Ancient *Fathers* and *Councils*, (even thoſe of *Nice*, *Epheſus* and *Calcedon*,) it was apparent that their *Authority* to *uſe* and *exerciſe* their *Power of Orders*, was allowed as well as their *Ordinations*: For he there ſhews, that *Anatolius* the *Preſident* of the *Fourth Council* was ordained by *Dioſcorus* in the Preſence of *Eutyches*; that many of the *Biſhops*, who ſat in the *Sixth Council* were ordained by *Sergius*, *Pyrrhus*, *Paulus*, and *Petrus*, who in that Council were declared *Hereticks*. And doth *T. G.* in earneſt think this doth not prove they had *lawful Authority*? What becomes then of the *Authority* of theſe *Councils*? Nay of the *Authority* of the *Church* it ſelf, when *Tarſius* there ſaith, as Dr. *St.* produceth him, *They had no other Ordinations for Fifty Years together.* Doth this prove either Dr. *St.*'s *Ignorance or Tergiverſation*? Is not this rather plain and convincing Evidence, that the *Chriſtian Church* did allow, not barely the *Validity* of *Ordination* by *Hereticks*, but the *lawful Authority to uſe and exerciſe the Power of Orders*? Which he likewiſe proves by the *Greek Ordinations* allowed by the *Church* of *Rome*; by which he doth not mean the *Validity* of the bare *Orders*, but all that *Power* and *Authority* which is conſequent upon them. For can any Man be ſo ſenſeleſs to think, that the *Church* of *Rome* only allowed the *Sacrament* of *Orders* among the *Greeks*, without any *Authority* to *excommunicate* or *abſolve*? What mean then theſe horrible Clamours by *T. G.* of Dr. *St.*'s *Ignorance*, *intolerable Miſtake*, *ſhameful Errors*, *Tergiverſation*, and what not? *Becauſe he ſpeaks only to the Validity of Ordination, and not to the lawful Authority of exerciſing the Power of Orders.* Whereas the contrary appears by that very *Preface* about which theſe Outcries are made by *E. W.* and *T. G.* What Ingenuity is to be expected from theſe Men, who deny that which they cannot but ſee?

*R. P.* But *T. G.* gives this for a *Taſte*, not only *what Candor and Sincerity, but what Skill in Church-Affairs you are to expect in the Reſt from Dr.* St. which ſurely he would never have done, if he had ſpoken to the Point. *Dial. p.* 132.

*P. D.* You may think as you pleaſe of him; I only tell you the Matter of Fact; and then do you judge where the *Candor* and *Sincerity*, where *the Skill in Church-Affairs* lies.

*R. P. But is it not an undeniable Maxim, that no Man can give to another, that which he hath not himſelf? And therefore it lies open to the Conſcience of every Man, That if the Church of* Rome *be guilty of Hereſy, much more, if guilty of Idolatry; it falls under the Apoſtle's Excommunication,* Gal. 1. 8. *and ſo remains deprived of the lawful Authority to uſe and excerciſe the Power of Orders, and conſequently the Authority of Governing, Preaching,* &c. *This you ſee bids fair towards the Subverſion of all lawful Authority in the Church of* England, *if the Church of* Rome *were guilty of Idolatry when the Schiſm began; becauſe excommunicated Perſons being* *Dial. p.* 133, 134.

*deprived of all lawful Authority themſelves can give none to others; and if thoſe others take any upon them, it muſt be uſurped and unlawful.*

*P. D.* This is the terrible Argument which *T. G.* produces again in *Triumph*, as though nothing were able to ſtand before it: And yet in my Mind *T. G.* himſelf hath mightily weakned it by yielding the *Validity* of *Ordinations* made by *Hereticks* or *Idolaters*. For, *if no Man can give that which he hath not*; how can thoſe give *Power* and *Authority* who have *none?* But the *Power* of *Orders* doth neceſſarily carry *Authority* along with it: For it is Part of the *Form* of *Orders* in the *Roman Church*, *Accipe Spiritum ſanctum, Quorum remiſſeritis*, &c. So that a *Power* to *excommunicate* and *abſolve*, is given by vertue of the very *Form* of *Orders*; and your *Divines* ſay, the *Form* is not compleat without it. But then, I pray, reſolve me theſe Queſtions. Is not a *Power* to *excommunicate* and *abſolve* a Part of that *Juriſdiction* which *T. G.* doth diſtinguiſh from the bare *Power* of *Orders?*

*Pontificale Rom de ordinat Preſbyt. Concil. Trident. Seſſ 23. c. 4.*

*R. P.* Yes, without doubt.

*P. D.* Is not this Power given by the very *Form* of *Orders* in your Church?

*R. P.* Yes, but what then?

*P. D.* Doth not the *Council* of *Trent* ſay, *The Character is imprinted upon ſaying thoſe Words, Accipe Spiritum ſanctum*, &c.

*R. P.* What would you be at?

*P. D.* Is the *Character* of *Orders* given by Words that ſignify nothing, and carry no Effect along with them?

*R. P.* No certainly.

*P. D.* Then theſe Words have their Effect upon every Man that hath the *Power* of *Orders*.

*R. P.* And what then?

*P. D.* Then, every one who hath the *Power* of *Orders*, hath the *Power* to *excommunicate* and *abſolve*.

*R. P.* Be it ſo.

*P. D.* But the *Power* to *excommunicate* and *abſolve*, is a Part of *Juriſdiction*; therefore a *Power* of *Orders* carries a *Power* of *Juriſdiction* along with it; and conſequently *valid Ordination* muſt ſuppoſe *lawful Authority* to *uſe* and *exerciſe* the *Power* of *Excommunication* and *Abſolution*.

*R. P.* In the Name of *T. G.* I deny that.

*P. D.* Hold a little; you are denying the Concluſion. Conſider again what you deny. Do you deny this *Power* to be given in your *Orders*?

*R. P.* No.

*P. D.* Do you deny this *Power* to be Part of *Juriſdiction*?

*R. P.* No.

*P. D.* Then this *Power* of *Juriſdiction* is given wherever the *Orders* are *valid*.

*R. P.* This cannot be; for *T. G.* complains over and over of Dr. *St.*'s *Ignorance, wilful and intolerable Miſtake, unbecoming a Writer of Controverſies*, for not diſtinguiſhing between the *Validity* of *Ordination*, and the *Power* of *Juriſdiction*; which he would never have done, if one had carried the other along with it.

*P. D.* Do not tell me, what *T. G.* would, or would not have done. I tell you what he hath done; and judge you now with what Advantage to himſelf.

*R. P.* But *T. G.* is again up with his undeniable *Maxim, That none can give to another what he hath not himſelf*; and this he thinks will carry him through all.

*Dial p. 143.*

*P. D.*

*P. D.* I tell you, that very Maxim overthrows the *Validity* of *Ordinations* as he applies it. For if the *Validity* of *Orders* doth ſuppoſe *Authority* to be conveyed ; and there can be no ſuch *Authority* given in the *Caſe* of *Idolatry* : Then the *Power* of *Orders* is taken away as well as *Juriſdiction.* Beſides, Is not the *Power* of *giving Orders* a part of that *lawful Authority* which belongs to *Biſhops.*

*R. P.* I do not underſtand you.

*P. D.* Can any Man give *Orders* without a *Power* to do it ?

*R. P.* No.

*P. D.* Is not that *Power* a part of *Epiſcopal Authority* ?

*R. P.* Yes.

*P. D.* How then can there be a *Power* of *giving Orders* without *Authority* ?

*R. P.* Now you ſhew your *Ignorance.* Do not you know that there is an *Indelible Character* imprinted in the *Soul* by the *Power* of *Orders*, which no Act of the Church can hinder a Biſhop from giving in the Sacrament of *Orders*, or a *Prieſt* from receiving; but *Juriſdiction* is quite another thing, that is derived from the *Church*, or rather from the *Pope* who is the *Fountain* of *Juriſdiction* ; and this may be ſuſpended or taken away.

*P. D.* I cry you Mercy, Sir. I was not bred up in your *Schools* ; this may be current Doctrine with you ; but I aſſure you, I find no Footſteps of it either in *Scripture* or *Fathers* ; and if I be not much mis-inform'd, ſome of your greateſt *Divines* are of my Mind. I ſee all this Outcry of *T. G.*'s concerning Dr. *St.*'s *Ignorance*, comes at laſt to this Myſtery of the *Indelible Character imprinted in the Soul by the Sacrament of Orders*, which makes *Ordination* to be valid, but gives no *Authority* or *Juriſdiction.* I pray make me a little better acquainted with this *Character* ; for at preſent, I can neither read, nor underſtand it.

*R. P.* Yes, yes, This you would be always at, to make us explain our *School-Notions*, for you to fleer and to mock at them.

*P. D.* But this I perceive, is very material to prevent *intolerable Error* and *Miſtake* ; and for all that you know I may come to be a *Writer* of *Controverſies*, and then I would not be hooted at for my *Ignorance* ; nor have the Boys point at me in the Streets, and ſay, There goes a Man that doth not underſtand the *Character* : Which in my mind would ſound as Ill, as ſaying, there goes one that cannot read his A B C. I beſeech you, Sir, tell me what this *Indelible Character* is ; for to tell you Truth, I have heard of it before, but never met with one who could tell what it was.

*R. P.* Yes, that is it ; you will not believe a thing, unleſs one can tell you *what it is.* Why, *it is a Mark or a Seal imprinted in the Soul by the Sacrament of Orders that can never be blotted out* ; and therefore *Ordination* is *valid* ; becauſe if *Re-ordination* were allowed, *one Character would be put upon another*, and ſo the firſt would be *blotted* out. Do not you underſtand it now ?

*P. D.* I ſuppoſe altogether as well as you. Is it a *Phyſical* Kind of thing, juſt like the Strokes of a Pen upon Paper ; or rather as the Graving of a Carver upon *Stone* ; ſo artificially done, that it can never be taken out while it continues whole ; or is it only a *Moral* relative Thing depending upon *Divine Inſtitution*, and only on the Account of Diſtinction called a *Character* ?

*R. P.* Without doubt it is an *Absolute Thing*; but whether to call it a *Habit*, or a *Power*; whether it be a *Quality* of the *First*, or the *Second*, or the *Third*, or *Fourth Kind*, that our *Divines* are not agreed upon: And some think it is a *new Kind of Quality*: Nor whether it be imprinted on the *Essence* or *Powers* of the *Soul*; and if in the *Faculties*, whether in the *Understanding* or *Will*; but it is enough for us to believe, that there is really such an *Absolute Indelible Character imprinted on the Soul*; from whence that Sacrament can never be reiterated which doth imprint a *Character* as that of *Orders* doth.

*P. D.* I am just as wise by all this Account as I was before. For the only Reason of the Point is, it must needs be so.

*R. P.* Yes, the *Church* hath declared it in the *Council* of *Trent*, and that is instead of all Reasons to us.

*P. D.* But what is this to Dr. *St.*? Must he be upbraided with *Ignorance*, *Error* and *Tergiversation*, because he doth not believe the *Indelible Character* on the *Authority* of the *Council* of *Trent*?

*R. P.* No; that is not the thing, but because he did not understand the Difference between the *Power* of *Order*, and *Jurisdiction*.

*P. D.* Are you sure of that? If I do not forget, he hath this very Distinction in that pestilent Book called *Irenicum*, which *T. G.* hits him in the Teeth with on all Occasions.

*R. P.* But he did not, or would not understand it here.

*P. D.* Yes, he knew it well enough; but he thought if he proved the *Validity* of *Ordination*, he proved the *Lawfulness* of *Authority* and *Jurisdiction*; because the *giving Orders* is part of *Church-Authority*, and the *Authority* is received in *taking Orders*; and the *Church* never allowed one, but it allowed the other also. If you have any thing more to say about this Matter, I am willing to hear you; but as yet I see no Reason for *T. G.*'s Clamours about such a *Mistake* in Dr. *St.*, for I think the Mistake lay nearer home.

*R. P. But* E. W. *publickly reproved Dr.* St. *for this Mistake; and yet after that he goes on to confirm his former Answer with new Proofs and Testimonies, that Bishops ordained by Idolaters were esteemed validly ordained,* Dial. p. 151, &c. *and doth not speak one Word in Answer to what was objected by* T. G. viz. *that the* English *Bishops must want lawful Authority to exercise the Power of Orders, if their first Ordainers were Idolaters. And* E. W. *calls it an intolerable Mistake*; and *T. G.* saith, *he hath heard he was a main Man esteemed for his Learning.* After repeating the Words of *E. W.* at length, *T. G.* very mildly adds, *as if he were wholly insensible of the gross* P. 155. *and intolerable Error* E. W. *taxed him with, he runs again into the same shameful* P. 157. *Mistake:* But saith *T. G. are the Power of giving Orders, and lawful Authority to give them, so essentially linked to each other, that they cannot be separated? May not a Bishop or Priest remaining so, be deprived of all lawful Authority to exercise their Functions, for having fal'n into Heresy or Idolatry? And if they have none themselves, can they give it to others?*

*P. D.* On whose Side *the intolerable Mistake* lies, will be best seen, by examining the Force of what *T. G.* saith; (as to *E. W.* the Matter is not great) which lies I suppose in this, *That those who do fall into Idolatry or Heresy may ordain validly*; for, saith he, from *Estius*, *no Crime, or Censure soever can hinder the Validity of Ordination by a Bishop; but he may be deprived of any lawful Authority to do it; and therefore cannot convey this lawful Authority to others ordained by him.* From hence *T. G.* saith,

ſaith, *no Crime can hinder the Validity of Ordination*; but *Idolatry*, he ſaith, doth, *ipſo facto deprive Biſhops of the Authority of exerciſing Orders, or conveying Juriſdiction; and therefore tho' the Ordination of the Biſhops of* England *may be valid, yet their Juriſdiction cannot be lawful; and ſo the Foundation of their Authority is ſubverted by the Charge of Idolatry.* I hope you will allow this to be the Force of all that *T. G.* ſaith.

*R. P.* Yes; now you have hit upon his right meaning.

*P. D.* Let us then conſider more cloſely, on which ſide the *Miſtake* lay; which will be diſcerned by this, whether we are to follow the *Modern Schools*, or the *Judgment* of *Antiquity* in this Matter. For Dr. *St.* ſpake according to the Senſe and Practice of *Antiquity*; and *T. G.* according to the *Modern Notions* and *Diſtinctions* of their *Schools.* It is true, their *Schoolmen* have ſo diſtinguiſhed the *Power* of *Order* and *Juriſdiction*, that they make the one to dependupon an *Indelible unintelligible Character*, which no Crime can hinder having its valid Effect: But that *Juriſdiction*, or the Right of Excommunication, and Abſolution may be ſuſpended or taken away. Since the *Councils* of *Florence* and *Trent*, this *Doctrine* of the *Indelible Character* given in *Orders*, is not to be diſputed among them; and therefore they hold *the Character* to remain wherever *Orders* are received in the due *Form*; but then they ſay, this *Character* is capable of ſuch Reſtraints by the *Power* of the *Church*, that it remains like *Ariſtotle*'s firſt Matter, a dull and unactive thing till the Church give a new *Form* to it; and this they call the *Power* of *Juriſdiction*. But that all this, is *new Doctrine* in the *Church*, and a late *Monkiſh* Invention, will appear by theſe Condeſiderations.

(1.) How long it was before this Doctrine was received in the *Church* by the Confeſſion of their own *Schoolmen*. *Scotus*, and *Biel*, and *Cajetan*, (no inconſiderable Men in the *Roman Church*) do confeſs, *that the Doctrine of the Character imprinted in the Soul can neither be proved from Scripture, nor Fathers, but only from the Authority of the Church*; and that not very Ancient neither. And *Morinus* takes notice, that it was not ſo much as mentioned by *P. Lombard*, or *Hugo de Sancto Victore*: Although they debate thoſe very *Queſtions* which would have required their expreſſing it, if they had known any thing of it.

Scot. in ſent. l. 4. diſt. 4. q. 9. Biel. in ſent q. 2. Cajet. in 3. P. q. 63. art. 1. Morin. de Ord. part. 3. Exercit. 3. c. 1. n. 4.

(2.) How many of their *Schoolmen* who do acknowledge the *Character* of *Prieſthood*; yet make the *Power* of *Orders* to belong to *Juriſdiction*; ſo *Albertus Magnus* and others cited by *Morinus*; but *Alex. Alenſis* carries this Point ſo far, that he ſaith, *That becauſe of the Indelible Character of Prieſthood, the Power can never be taken from a Prieſt, but only the Execution* of it; *But in a Biſhop there is no new Character imprinted; and therefore in the degrading him, not only the Execution, but the Power of Giving Orders is taken away.* And *Scotus* ſaith, *if a Biſhop be excommunicated, he loſeth the Power of giving Orders; if Epiſcopacy be not a diſtinct Order*; as you know many of the *Schoolmen* hold. And *Morinus* grants, *that if Epiſcopacy be not a diſtinct Order, but a larger Commiſſion, the Power of Biſhops may be ſo limited by the Church, as not only to hinder them from a lawful Authority, but from a Power of Acting; ſo that what they do, carries no Validity along with it.*

Alex. Al. 4. p. q. 8. memb. 5. art. 1 Sect. 6. ad 2. Scot. in 4. diſt. 25. q. 1. reſp. ad 3. Morin. ib. exerc 5 c. 9. n. 12, 13.

(3.) How many before the Days of the *Schoolmen* were of Opinion, that the *Cenſures* of the *Church* did take away the *Power* of *Orders*? *Gratian* holds it moſt agreeable to the *Doctrine* of the *Fathers*, *that a Biſhop degraded hath no Power to give Orders, although he hath to Baptize*; only for S. *Auguſtin*'s Sake, he thinks, they may diſtinguiſh between the *Power* and

Grat 1. q. 8 poſt. can. 97.

the

Gul. Paris. de Sacr. Ord. c. 7. the *Execution* of it. *Gul. Parisiensis* saith, *That Bishops deposed can confer no Order, because the Church hath the same Power in taking away, which it hath in giving; and the Intention of the Church is to take away their Power.* If what *T. G.* asserts, had been always the Sense of the *Church*, I desire him to resolve me these Questions. 1. Why Pope *Lucius* III. did re-ordain those, who had been ordained by *Octavianus* the *Anti-pope*? 2. Why *Urban* II. declared *Nezelon* or *Wecilo* an excommunicate *Bishop* of *Ments* to have no Power of giving Orders? And that upon *T. G.*'s own Maxim, *That which a Man hath not, he cannot give to another*; because he was ordained by *Hereticks*. 3. Why the *Synod* of *Quintilinberg* under *Greg.* VII. declared all *Ordinations* to be *Null* which were made by *Excommunicated Bishops?* 4. Why *Leo* IX. in a *Synod* voided all *Simoniacal Ordinations*? 5. Why *Stephanus* VI. re-ordained those which were ordained by *Formosus*? 6. Why *Hincmarus* re-ordained those who had been ordained by *Ebbo*, because he had been *deposed*? 7. Why *Stephanus* IV. re-ordained those who had received *Orders* from *Pope Constantine*? 8. Why the Ordinations made by *Photius* were declared *Null?* To name no more. If this had been always the Sense of the *Christian Church*, that the *Power* of *Orders* is *indelible*, but not that of *Jurisdiction*: I desire *T. G.* to give an Answer to those Questions, which I fear will involve several *Heads* of his *Church* under that which he calls in Dr. *St. An intolerable Mistake.* Did so many Popes know no better this Distinction between the *Validity* of *Ordination*, and the *Power* of *Jurisdiction?* I am sorry to see *T. G.* so magisterial and confident; so insulting over Dr. *St.* as betraying so much *Ignorance as doth not become a Writer of Controversies*, when all the while, he doth only expose his own. But alas! This is the current *Divinity* of the *Modern Schools*; and what obliges them to look into the Opinions of Former Ages? Yet methinks a Man had need to look about him, before he upbraids another with *gross and intolerable Errors*, lest at the same time he prove the guilty Person; and then the Charge falls back far more heavily on himself.

(4.) Those who did hold the *Validity* of *Ordinations* did it chiefly on the Account of the due *Form* that was observed, whoever the *Persons* were; whether *Hereticks*, or *Excommunicated Persons.* For after all the Heats and Disputes which hapned in the *Church* about this Matter, the best way they found to resolve it, was to observe the same Course which the Church had done in the *Baptism* of *Hereticks*: *viz.* To allow that *Baptism* which was administred in *due Form*, although those who administred it were *Hereticks.* Thence *Præpositivus*, as he is quoted by *Morinus*, saith, *That a Heretick hath Power to administer all the Sacraments as long as he observes the Form of the Church.* And not only such a one as received *Episcopal Orders* in the *Church* himself, but those who do derive a Succession from such; as appears from *Tarasius* in the Second *Council* of *Nice*, where he saith, *That Five Bishops of* Constantinople *successively were Hereticks*; *and yet their Ordinations were allowed by the Church*: To the same Purpose speak others, who are there produced by the same learned Author. Let these Considerations be laid together, and the Result will be, 1. Either Dr. *St.* was not guilty of *an intolerable Error and Mistake* in this Matter, or so many infallible *Heads* of the Church were guilty of the same. 2. It was believed for some Ages in the *Roman Church*, that the *Censures* of the *Church* did take away the *Power* of *Orders.* 3. *T. G.*'s Distinction as to the Foundation of it in the *indelible Character of Orders* is a novel thing, and acknowledged by their own

Morin de Ord. Sacr. p. 3. ex. 5. c. 1. n. 3.

*Divines*

*Divines* to have no Foundation either in *Scripture* or *Fathers*. 4. The ground assigned by those who held the *Validity* of *Ordination* by *Hereticks*, will hold for the *Authority* of exercising the *Power* of *Orders*, if not actually taken away by the *Censures* of the *Church*. For every Man hath the Power which is given him, till it be taken from him; every one that receives *Orders* according to the *Form* of the *Church* hath a *Power* given him to *excommunicate* and *absolve*; therefore every such Person doth enjoy that *Power*, till it be taken from him. For as I have already shewed, this is Part of the *Form* of *Orders* in the *Roman Church*, *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*, *Quorum remiseritis*, &c. and the *Council* of *Trent* determines the Character to be imprinted upon the Use of these Words: Therefore this *Power of Jurisdiction* is conveyed by the *due Form of Orders*; from whence it unavoidably follows that every one, who hath had the *due Form of Orders*, hath had this *Power* conveyed to him; and what *Power* he hath, he must enjoy till it be taken away.

Conc. Trid. sess. 23. can. 4.

*R. P.* But *T. G.* saith, *That Excommunication by the Apostle's Sentence doth it*, Gal. 1. 8.

*P.D.* This is indeed a Piece of *new Doctrine*, and a Fruit of *T. G.*'s *Mother-Wit*; and which I dare say, he received neither from *Schoolmen* nor *Fathers*. For it involves such mischievous Consequences in it as really overthrow all *Authority* in the *Church*. For by this Supposition, in case any Bishop falls into *Heresy* or *Idolatry*, he is *ipso facto excommunicated by St.* Paul's *Sentence*; and consequently hath no *Authority* to exercise the the *Power* of *Orders*; and so all who derive their *Power* from him have no *lawful Authority*, or *Jurisdiction*. I do wonder in all this time *T. G.* did no better reflect upon this Assertion, and the Consequences of it; and rather to thank Dr. *St.* that he took no more Notice of it, than upbraid him with *intolerable Error and Mistake*. I will put a plain case to you to shew you the ill Consequence of this Assertion to the *Church* of *Rome* it self. Dr. *St.* hath proved by undeniable Evidence, that the *Arians* were looked on and condemned as *Idolaters* by the *Primitive Church*: And *T. G.* doth not deny it; and what now, if we find an *Arian* among the *Bishops* of *Rome*, and from whom the *Succession* is derived? He must stand excommunicated by vertue of the Apostle's Sentence; and therefore hath no *Authority* to give *Orders*; and so all the *Authority* in the *Church* of *Rome* is lost. The Case, I mean, is that of *Liberius*; who shewed himself as much an *Arian*, as any of the *Arian Bishops* did; for he subscribed their *Confession* of *Faith*, and joined in Communion with them. St. *Hierom* saith more than once, *That he subscribed to Heresy*; the *Pontifical Book* saith, *He communicated with Hereticks*; *Marcellinus* and *Faustinus* say, *That he renounced the Faith by his Subscription*; yea more than this, *Hilary* denounced an *Anathema* against him, and all that joined with him: And *Baronius* confesseth, *he did communicate with the Arians*, which is sufficient to our Purpose. Then comes *T. G.* upon him, *with St.* Paul's *Sentence of Excommunication*; and so he loseth all *Authority* of *exercising the Power of Orders*; and consequently, that *Authority* which is challenged in the *Church* of *Rome* being derived from him is all lost. And now judge, *who subverts the Foundation of Ecclesiastical Authority* most, *T. G.* or Dr. *St.*; yet it falls out unhappily, *that Pet. Damiani* mentions these very *Ordinations* of *Liberius* the *Heretick* (so he calls him) to shew how the *Church* did allow *Ordinations* made by *Hereticks*. But this is not all; for by all that I can find, if this Principle

S Hier. de script. Eccles. in Fortunat. in Chronico. Libel. precum, p. 4. Baron A. D. 357. n. 46.

Pet. Dam. Gom. opusc. 7. c. 16.

of

Libel. prec. p. 26. Subscribentes in illa fide Arianorum, quam integro & libero judicio damnaverant: advertit Sapientia vestra, Aminensem Synodum, piissimè cœptam, sed impiissimè terminatam.

of *T. G.* be allowed, no Man can be sure there is any *lawful Ecclesiastical Authority* left in the World. For who can tell what *secret Idolaters* or *Hereticks* there might be among those *Bishops* from whom that Authority is derived? This we are sure of, that the *Arian Bishops* possessed most of the *Eastern Churches*, and made *Ordinations* there: And the *Western Bishops* in the *Council* of *Ariminum* did certainly comply with them: As is now plain from *Marcellinus* and *Faustinus*, whose Book was published by *Sirmondus* at *Paris*; where *Sulpitius Severus* saith, more than Four hundred *Western Bishops* were present; who were all *excommunicated* by *T. G.*'s Principle; and what now becomes of all *Ecclesiastical Authority*? But Dr. *St.* hath shewed that the *Christian Church* was *wiser*, than to proceed upon *T. G.*'s Principle; proving from *Authentick Testimonies* of *Antiquity*, that the *Arian Ordinations* were allowed by the *Church*, altho' the *Arians* were condemned for *Idolaters*.

Dial. p 156, 157

*R. P.* Yes, *T. G.* saith, *That Dr.* St. *was resolved to go on in the same Track still; and to prove that the Act it self of Ordination is not invalid in Case of the Idolatry of the Givers, which was never denied by his Adversary.*

*P. D.* How is it possible to satisfy Men who are resolved to cavil? Doth not Dr. *St.* by that Instance of the *Arian Bishops* evidently prove, that the *Authority* of *giving Orders* was allowed by the *Christian Church* at that time, and that which he calls their *Jurisdiction* as well as the *Power* of *Orders*? because nothing more was required from the *Arian Bishops*, but renouncing *Arianism*, and subscribing the *Nicene Creed*; and thus for all that I can see by *T. G.*'s Principle, they still remained under *S. Paul's Excommunication*; and so *Ecclesiastical Authority* is all gone with them.

Dial. p. 161.

*R. P.* But do not you think, that Dr. *St.* had some *secret Design* in all this really *to subvert the Authority of the Church of* England? For *T. G.* lays together several notable things to that purpose to make it appear, *that he purposely declined defending the Ecclesiastical Authority of the Church of* England: I assure you it is a very Politick Discourse, and hath several deep Fetches in it. *First, he begins with his* Irenicum, *and there he lays the Foundation, that the Government may be changed.* 2. *The Book was reprinted since the Bishops were re-established by Law.* 3. *He perswades the Bishops in that Book to reduce the Form of Church-Government to its Primitive State and Order, by restoring Presbyteries under them,* &c. 4. *When this would not do, he charges the Church of* Rome *with Idolatry, and makes this the Sense of the Church of* England, *to make her contribute to the Subversion of her own Authority.* 5. *When* T. G. *told him of the Consequence of this, he passed it by, as if he saw it not; and trifled with his Adversary about the Validity of Ordination.* 6. *When* E. W. *endeavoured to bring him to this Point, he still declined it, and leaves Episcopacy to shift for it self.* And after all these *T. G.* thinks, *he hath found out the Mole that works under Ground.*

*P. D.* A very great *Discovery* I assure you! and *T. G.* deserves a greater Reward than any common *Mole-catchers* do. But I never liked such *Politick Informers*; for if People are more dull and quiet than they would have them, they make Plots for them to keep up their Reputation and Interest. They must have always something to whisper in Great Men's Ears, and to fill their Heads with Designs which were never thought of; by which Means they torment them with unreasonable Suspicions, and tyrannize

tyrannize over them under a Pretence of Kindneſs. Juſt thus doth *T. G.* do by the *Governors* of our *Church*: He would fain perſwade them, that there is one Dr. *St.* who hath undertaken to defend the Church; but doth carry on a very ſecret and ſubtle Deſign to ruin and deſtroy it. If they ſay, *They do not believe it*; he ſeems to pity them for their Incredulity and Weakneſs; and endeavours to convince them, by a long Train of his own Inventions; and if they be ſo eaſie to hearken to it, and to regard his Inſinuations, then he flatters and applauds them as the only Friends to the Church; when in the mean time he really *laughs* at them as a ſort of weak Men, who can be impoſed upon by any Man who pretends to be a Friend, although even in that he doth them and the *Church* the greater Miſchief. I cannot believe ſuch kind of Inſinuations as theſe can prevail upon any one Man of Underſtanding in our *Church*, againſt a Perſon who has at leaſt endeavoured his utmoſt to defend it. But ſince *T. G.* talks ſo politickly about theſe Matters, I will convince you by one Argument of common Prudence, that if Dr. *St.* be a Man of common Senſe, (much more if he be ſo politick and deſigning as *T. G.* repreſents him) all theſe Suggeſtions muſt be both falſe and fooliſh. For that which all deſigning Men aim at, is their own Intereſt and Advantage: Now can any Man that hath common Senſe left in him, imagine that Dr. *St.* can aim at any greater Advantage by *ruining* the *Church*, than by *preſerving* it? Are not his Circumſtances more conſiderable in the *Church* of *England* than ever he can hope they ſhould be, if it were deſtroyed? They who would perſuade others that he carries on ſuch a *ſecret Deſign*, muſt ſuppoſe him to be next to an *Ideot*; and ſuch are not very dangerous Politicians. But what is it then ſhould make him act ſo much againſt his Intereſt? It can be nothing but Folly or Malice. But I do not find they have taxed him of any Malice to the *Church* of *England*, or of any Occaſion for it which the *Church* hath given him, if he were diſpoſed to it. Why then ſhould any be ſo ſenſeleſs themſelves, or ſuppoſe others to be ſo, as to go about to poſſeſs Men with an Opinion of an underground Plot Dr. *St.* is carrying on, not only to blow up the *Thames*, but the riſing Fabrick of St. *Paul's* too; *i. e.* to ruin and deſtroy himſelf? If he be a *Fool*, he is not to be feared; if he be not, he is not to be miſtruſted.

*R. P.* But what ſay you to *T. G.*'s Proofs? Do you obſerve *the ſeveral Molehills which he hath caſt up*; and is not that a Sign he works *underground*? What ſay you to his *Irenicum* in the *firſt Place*?

*P. D.* I will tell you freely: I believe there are many things in it, which if Dr. *St.* were to write now, he would not have ſaid; for there are ſome things which ſhew his Youth, and want of due Conſideration; others which he yielded too far in Hopes of gaining the diſſenting Parties to the *Church* of *England*; but upon the whole Matter I am fully ſatisfied the Book was written with a Deſign *to ſerve the Church of England*: And the Deſign of it, I take to be this; That among us there was no Neceſſity of entring upon nice and ſubtle Diſputes about a ſtrict *Jus Divinum* of *Epiſcopacy*, ſuch as makes all other *Forms* of Government *unlawful*; but it was ſufficient for us, if it were proved to be the moſt ancient and agreeable to *Apoſtolical Practice*, and moſt accommodate to our *Laws* and *Civil Government*; and there could be no Pretence againſt ſubmiting to it, but the demonſtrating its *Unlawfulneſs*, which he knew was impoſſible to be done. And for what Propoſals he makes about tempering *Epiſcopacy*, they were no other than what King *Charles* I.

and Mr. *Thorndike* had made before him; and doth *T. G.* think they designed *to ruin the Church of England*? And as long as he declared this to be the Design of his Book both at the Beginning and Conclusion of it; suppose he were mistaken in the Means he took, must such a Man be presently condemned as one that aimed at the *Ruin* and *Destruction* of the *Church*?

*R. P.* But *T. G.* saith, *He tendred it to Consideration after Episcopacy was resettled by Law.*

*P. D.* That is as true as others of his Suggestions. The *Book* was printed while things were unsettled, and was intended to remove the violent Prejudices of the *Dissenting Party* against *Episcopal Government*; and I have heard, did considerable Service that way, at least in a Neighbour Kingdom; and it hapned to be reprinted afterwards, with the same Title it had before. But what then? Do not *Booksellers* look on *Books* as their own, and do what they please with them, without the Authors Consent or Approbation? Hath he ever Preached or Written any Doctrine since, contrary to the Sense of the *Church* of *England*? Hath he made any Party or Faction to the Disturbance of the Peace of the Church? Hath he not conformed to its Rules, observed its Offices, obeyed his Superiors, and been ready to defend its *Cause* against *Adversaries* of all Sorts? And can *Malice* it self, after all this, fasten such a Calumny upon him, That *he is a secret Enemy to the Church of* England, *and designs to ruin and destroy it?* I remember a poor *Englishman* in *Amboyna* being cruelly tormented by the *Dutch*; and finding nothing he could say would perswade his Tormentors to release him; (and he said any thing that he thought would prevail with them) at last he prayed God, that he might tell them *Probable Lies.* I would advise *T. G.* the next time he goes a *Mole-catching*, to find out *Probable Plots*, otherwise he will lose all the Reputation of an *Informer* and *Discoverer.* But I can hardly tell, whether his *Plot* or his *Proofs* were the worse; for as there appears no Likelihood in the *Plot*, so there is no Evidence in the *Proofs.* There being nothing pretended since the *Irenicum*, but this *Charge of Idolatry*; and that hath been sufficiently cleared already, by shewing that it doth not *subvert* the *Authority* of the *Church* of *England.*

*R. P.* Let us now, if you please, proceed to the other *dangerous Consequences of this Charge*, as they are muster'd up by *T. G.*: One is, *That it overthrows the Article of the Holy Catholick Church.*

*P. D.* That is something indeed: What! doth it take away an Article of the Creed? Nay, then it is time to look about us. But how I pray?

*R. P.* I will you tell how. *If the Church hath been guilty of Idolatry,* (1.) *Then she hath required and enjoyned Idolatry, for many Hundreds of Years parallel to the Heathens.* (2.) *Then* Mahomet *had more Wisdom and Power to carry on his Design than the Son of God; for his Followers have been preserved from it by the grounds he laid, above a Thousand Years.* (3.) *Then our Forefathers had better been converted to Judaism or Turcism than to Christianity as they were.*

Dial. p. 66, 67.

*P. D.* I deny every one of these Consequences. For our present Dispute is only about the *Church* of *Rome*'s being guilty of *Idolatry*; and from thence (1.) it doth not follow, *That the whole Christian Church must require Idolatry*, if that doth; unless *T.G.* had proved, that all other *Churches* are equally involved in the same Guilt; which he never attempted. (2.) It doth not follow, *That* Mahomet *was wiser than Christ*; for if you com-

compare the Grounds laid for Divine Worſhip by *Chriſt* and *Mahomet*; I ſay, that *Chriſt* did ſhew infinitely more *Wiſdom* in them, than ſo vile an *Impoſtor*; and it is a Shame for any *Chriſtian* to ſuggeſt the contrary: But if *T. G.* ſpeaks of *Power to carry on his Deſign*; then it muſt ſuppoſe, that *Mahomet's Power* hath preſerved the *Mahumetan Religion* ſo long free from *Idolatry*, altho' *Chriſt* hath not; which muſt imply the Greatneſs of *Mahomet's Power in Heaven*; and ſo it borders upon *Blaſphemy*. (3.) It doth not follow, *that our Forefathers had better been converted to Judaiſm or Turciſm than to Chriſtianity*. For they had incomparably greater Advantages towards their Salvation than either *Turks* or *Pagans*; and ſuch Circumſtances might accompany their Practice of *Idolatry*, as might make it not to hinder their Salvation. But I ſhall give you a full Anſwer to this in the Words of Biſhop *Sanderſon*, (who is another *competent Witneſs*, if any more were needful, that Dr. *St.* doth not in the *Charge* of *Idolatry* contradict the Senſe of the *Church* of *England*.) "We have much "Reaſon to conceive good Hope of the Salvation of many of our Fore- "fathers: Who led away with the common Superſtitions of thoſe blind "Times, might yet by thoſe general Truths, which by the Mercy of "God were preſerved among the fouleſt over-ſpreadings of Popery, a- "greeable to the Word of God (though clogged with an Addition of "many Superſtitions, and Antichriſtian Inventions withal) be brought "to true Faith in the Son of God; unfeigned Repentance from Dead "Works; and a ſincere Deſire and Endeavour of New and Holy Obe- "dience. This was the Religion that brought them to Heaven, even "Faith and Repentance, and Obedience. This is the True, and the "Old and the Catholick Religion: And this is our Religion, in which "we hope to find Salvation; and if ever any of you that miſcall your "ſelves Catholicks come to Heaven, it is this Religion muſt carry you "thither. If together with this true Religion of Faith, Repentance, "and Obedience, they embraced alſo your Additions, as their blind "Guides then led them; prayed to our Lady, kneeled to an Image, crept "to a Croſs, flocked to a Maſs as you now do: Theſe were their Spots "and their Blemiſhes; theſe were their Hay and Stubble; theſe were "their Errors, and their Ignorances. And I doubt not, but as St. *Paul* "for his Blaſphemies and Perſecutions, ſo they obtained Mercy for theſe "Sins, becauſe they did them ignorantly in Misbelief. And upon the "ſame ground we have cauſe alſo to hope charitably of many thouſand "poor Souls in *Italy*, *Spain*, and other Parts of the Chriſtian World at "this Day, that by the ſame bleſſed Means they may attain Mercy and "Salvation in the End; although in the mean time through Ignorance "they defile themſelves with much foul Idolatry, and many groſs Su- "perſtitions.

B. Sanderſ. *on* Gen. 20. 6. n. 17.

"*Obj.* But the Ignorance which excuſeth from Sin, is *Ignorantia facti*, "according to that hath been already declared; but theirs was *Ignoran-* "*tia juris*, which excuſeth not. And beſides, as they lived in the Pra- "ctice of that Worſhip which we call Idolatry, ſo they died in the ſame "without Repentance; and ſo their Caſe is not the ſame with St. *Paul's*, "who ſaw thoſe Sins, and ſorrowed for them, and forſook them; "but how can Idolaters, living and dying ſo without Repentance, be "ſaved?

"*Anſ.* It is anſwered, that Ignorance in Point of Fact ſo conditioned "as hath been ſhewed doth ſo excuſe *à toto*, that an Action proceeding

" thence, tho' it have a Material Inconformity with the Law of God, is " yet not formally a Sin. But I do not ſo excuſe the Idolatry of our " Foreſathers, as if it were not in it ſelf a Sin; and that (without Re- " pentance) damnable. But yet their Ignorance being ſuch as it was, " nouriſhed by Education, Cuſtom, Tradition, the Tyranny of their " Leaders, the Faſhion of the Times, not without Shew alſo of Piety " and Devotion, and themſelves, withal, having ſuch ſlender Means of " better Knowledge; tho' it cannot wholly excuſe them from Sin with- " out Repentance, damnable, yet it much leſſeneth and qualifieth the " Sinfulneſs of their Idolatry; arguing, that their Continuance therein " was more from other Prejudices, than from a wilful Contempt of God's " Holy Word and Will. And as for their Repentance, it is as certain, " that as many of them as are ſaved, did repent of their Idolatries; as " it is certain, no Idolater nor other Sinner can be ſaved without Repen- " tance. But then there is a double Difference to be obſerved between " Repentance for Ignorances, and known Sins; the one muſt be parti- " cular, the other general; the one cannot be ſincere without forſaking, " the other may; which he enlarges upon; and then concludes, Some " of our Forefathers then, might not only live in Popiſh Idolatry, but " even die in an Idolatrous Act; breathing out their laſt with their Lips " at a Crucifix, and an *Ave Mary* in their Thoughts: And yet have " truly repented, (tho' but in the General, and the Crowd of their un- " known Sins) even of thoſe very Sins; and have at the ſame Inſtant " true Faith in Jeſus Chriſt, and other Graces accompanying Salva- " tion.

*R. P. But hath not Chriſt promiſed that the Gates of Hell ſhall never prevail againſt his Church?*

*P. D.* This Dr. *St.* hath already anſwered thus. " Againſt what " Church? The whole Chriſtian Church? who ever ſaid they could, " or how doth that follow? The Church of *Conſtantinople*, or the *Church* of " *Jeruſalem*? Have not the *Gates* of the *Turk* been too ſtrong for them? " The *Church* of *Rome*? The Gates of Hell do certainly prevail againſt " that, if it doth unchurch all other Churches that are not of its Com- " munion. And why may not Idolatry prevail where Luciferian Pride, " and Helliſh Cruelty, and deſperate Wickedneſs have long ſince prevailed? " Hath Chriſt made Promiſes to ſecure that Church from Error, which " hath been over-run with all Sorts of Wickedneſs by the Confeſſion of " her own Members and Friends?

*Dial. p. 68, 69.* *R. P.* But *T. G.* ſaith, *That Dr.* St. *ought to have aſſigned us ſome Church diſtinct in all Ages, from all Heretical and Idolatrous Congregations, which Chriſt hath preſerved always from Hereſy and Idolatry?*

*P. D.* Why ſo? Unleſs he had firſt yielded, that Chriſt had promiſed to preſerve ſuch a diſtinct Congregation of Chriſtians, which he never did. But he ſhewed the Feebleneſs of that kind of arguing, from *Particulars* to *Generals*; as tho' all the Promiſes made to the *Church* muſt fail, if the *Church* of *Rome* be guilty of *Idolatry*.

*R. P.* But I will prove, *that Dr.* St. *ought to aſſign ſuch a diſtinct Church*, becauſe he ſaith, *that a Chriſtian by vertue of his being ſo, is bound to join in ſome Church or Congregation of Chriſtians; therefore there muſt be ſuch a Church at all times to join with.*

*P. D.* I anſwer, (1.) Dr. *St.*'s Anſwer doth imply no more than this, That a Chriſtian is bound to join with other Chriſtians in the Acts of God's Publick Worſhip; but withal he adds immediately, that he is bound

bound to chuſe the Communion of the pureſt Church ; which doth ſuppoſe a Competition between two Churches, where a Perſon may embrace the Communion of either ; as the *Church* of *England*, and the *Church* of *Rome*. So that where there are diſtinct Communions, the beſt is to be choſen. (2.) Suppoſing no Church to be ſo pure that a Man's Conſcience can be fully ſatisfied in all the Practices of it ; yet he may lawfully hold Communion with that *Church* he is baptized in, till the unlawful Practices become the Condition of his Communion. As here in *England*, the Conditions of Communion are different as to *Clergymen* and *Laymen* ; if the latter be ſatisfied in what concerns them, they have no Reaſon to reject Communion themſelves, for what concerns others. (3.) Where any Church doth require Idolatrous Acts as Conditions of Communion, that *Church* is the *Cauſe* of a Separation made for a *diſtinct Communion*. So that there is no Neceſſity of aſſigning a *diſtinct Church* in all *Ages* free from *Hereſy* and *Idolatry* ; ſince Men may communicate with a corrupt Church, ſo they do not communicate in their Corruptions ; and when they come to that Height to require this, they make themſelves the *Cauſes* of the Separation which is made on the Account of *Hereſy* or *Idolatry*.

*R. P.* Still that Promiſe ſticks with me, *that the Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt the Church* : And are not *Hereſy* and *Idolatry* the two *Poſts* of thoſe *Gates* ?

*P. D.* If you turn over that Promiſe never ſo much, you will prove no more from it, than the Continuance of a *Chriſtian Church* in the World, with a Capacity of *Salvation* to the Members of it. And this we do not deny : But it doth not prove that any particular *Church* ſhall be preſerved in all Ages free from *Hereſy* and *Idolatry*. For whatever may be conſiſtent with the *Salvation* of the *Members* of a *Church*, may be conſiſtent with the *Gates* of *Hell* not prevailing againſt it ; but *Hereſy* and *Idolatry* may be conſiſtent with the *Salvation* of the Members of a *Church* : Becauſe there are ſo many Caſes aſſigned by *Divines*, wherein *Sins* of *Ignorance* and *Error*, are conſiſtent with *Salvation*. I ſay then, that *Chriſt's Promiſes* do prove a *Poſſibility* of *Salvation* in all *Ages* of the *Chriſtian Church* ; but they do not prove the Indefectibility of any diſtinct Church.

*R. P.* But why doth Dr. *St.* ſay, *the Gates of Hell have prevail'd againſt the Church of* Rome, *when himſelf acknowledges it to be a true Church ? as holding all the Eſſential Points of Faith* ? *Dial. p. 70.*

*P. D.* As tho' a Man could be damned for nothing, but for denying the *Articles* of his *Creed !* It is in reſpect of *Pride*, *Cruelty*, and all Sorts of *Wickedneſs*, as well as *Idolatry*, that he ſaith, *the Gates of Hell have prevailed againſt it.*

*R. P.* Well ! But *T. G.* for all that proves, *that all Chriſtians are bound by virtue of their Chriſtianity to join in Communion with the Church of* Rome. *Dial. p. 73.*

*P. D.* Doth he ſo ? It is a great Undertaking, and becoming *T. G.* But how ?

*R. P.* Firſt, *There was in the World before* Luther *a diſtinct Church, whoſe Communion was neceſſary to Salvation* ; *but this was not the* Proteſtant, *for that came in after* Luther ; *therefore it was the* Roman.

*P. D.* This is very ſubtle Reaſoning ; yet it is poſſible we may find out ſomething like it. There was in the World before *Julius Cæſar* ſome Civil Society, in which it was neceſſary for a Man to live for his own Preſervation ; but this was not the *Roman Empire*, for that roſe up after him ;

him; therefore it was the *Roman Commonwealth*. But doth this imply, that there was no other Civil Society in the World, wherein a Man could preserve himself, but the *Roman Commonwealth*? But I will put the Case a little farther home; after *Britain* was made a *Province*, it became a *Member* of the *Roman Empire*, and depended so much upon the Strength and *Arms* of *Rome*, that it was not able to defend it self; it being sore distressed by Enemies, and in Danger of Ruin, sends to *Rome* for Help; there it is denied, and the *Britains* forced to look out for Help elsewhere. Now after *T. G.*'s way of Reasoning, the *Britains* must return to the *Romans*, because once they had been *Members* of the *Roman Empire*. The Case is alike in the *Church*; the Time was when the *Western Church* was united under one *Head*, but by Degrees this *Head* grew too heavy, and laid too great a Load on the Members, requiring very hard and unreasonable Conditions from them; upon this, some of the Members seek for Relief; this is denied them; they take care of their own Safety, and do what is necessary to preserve themselves. The *Head* and some corrupt *Members* conspiring, denounce Excommunication, if they do not presently yield and submit. These Parts stand upon their own Rights and Ancient Privileges; that it was not an *Union* of *Submission* but *Association*, originally between several *National Churches*: And therefore the *Church* of *Rome* assuming so much more to it self, than did belong to it, and dealing so *tyrannically*; upon just Complaints our *Church* had Reason to assert her own *Freedom*, and to reform the Abuses which had crept either into her Doctrine or Practice. And that this was lawful Proceeding, it offered to justify by Scripture and Reason, and the Rules of the Primitive Church. Now the Question of Communion, as it was stated between *T. G.* and Dr. *St.* comes to this, whether any Person being baptized in this *Church*, ought in order to his Salvation to forsake the Communion of it, for that of the Church of *Rome*? And this being the true State of it, I pray, where lies the Force of the Argument? Dr. *St.* yields Communion with some *Church* to be necessary: And what follows, the Communion of the *Church* of *England* is so to one baptized in it; why must any such leave it for that of the *Church* of *Rome*? *Yes*, saith *T. G.*, *there was a distinct Church before* Luther, *whose Communion was necessary to Salvation*; and what then? What have we to do with *Luther*? We are speaking of the present *Church* of *England*, which was reformed by it self, and not by *Luther*. Why is it necessary to leave this *Church*, in which Persons are baptized, and not in that before *Luther*? Here lies the main Hinge of the Controversie; to which *T. G.* ought to speak, and not to run to a *Church* before *Luther*. The *Church* of *England* was the *Church* of *England* before the *Reformation* as well as since; but it hath now reformed it self, being an entire Body within it self; having Bishops to govern it, Priests and Deacons to administer Sacraments, to preach the Word of God, to officiate in the Publick Liturgy, in which all the *Ancient Creeds* are read and owned; the Question now is, whether Salvation cannot be had in the Communion of this *Church*? Or all Persons are bound to return to the *Church* of *Rome*? This is the Point, if *T. G.* hath any more to say to it.

Dial. p. 74. *R. P. T. G.* urgeth farther, *Nothing can render the Communion of the* Roman *Church not necessary to Salvation, but either Heresy or Schism; not Heresy, because She holds all the Essential Articles of Christian Faith; not Schism, because then Dr.* St. *must assign some other distinct Church, (then at least in Being) from whose Unity She departed.*

*P.D.*

*P. D.* A right *Doway* Argument! One would take *T. G.* for a young *Miſſioner* by it; it is ſo exactly cut in their Form. But it proceeds upon ſuch falſe Suppoſitions as theſe: (1.) That Communion with the *Roman Church* as *ſuch*, *i. e.* as a Body united under ſuch a *Head*, was neceſſary to Salvation, which we utterly deny; and it can never be proved, but by ſhewing, That *Chriſt* appointed the *Biſhop* of *Rome* to be *Head* of the *Church*; which is an Argument, I do not find that now-a-days, you are willing to enter upon, being ſo thread-bare and baffled a Topick. (2.) That no Doctrines, but ſuch as are contrary to the *Articles* of the *Creed*, can be any reaſon to hold off from the *Communion* of *a Church*; but we think, the requiring Doubtful Things for Certain, Falſe for True, New for Old, Abſurd for Reaſonable, are Ground enough for us not to embrace the Communion of a Church, unleſs it may be had on better Terms than theſe. (3.) That no *Church* can be guilty of *Schiſm*, unleſs we can name ſome *diſtinct Church* from whoſe *Unity* it ſeparated; whereas we have often proved, that impoſing unreaſonable Conditions of *Communion*, makes the Church ſo impoſing guilty of the *Schiſm*. Surely *T. G.*'s Stock is almoſt ſpent, when he plays the ſame Game ſo often over. Theſe are not ſuch terrible Arguments to be produced afreſh, as if they had never been heard of; when there is not a *Miſſioner* that comes, but hath them at his Fingers End.

*R. P. But the* Roman *Church was once the True Church*, Rom. 1. *and the Chriſtian World of all Ages, believed it to be the only True Church of Chriſt; but it cannot be proved not to be the true one, by an Evidence equal to that which once proved it true; therefore we are bound to be of the Communion of that Church.* Dial. p. 78.

*P. D.* O the Virtue of Sodden Coleworts! How often are they produced without Shame! To be ſhort, Sir: (1.) We deny that the *Church* of which the *Pope* is *Head*, was ever commended by St. *Paul*; or in any *One Age* of the Chriſtian World, was owned by it to be the *only true Church*: Which is very much ſhort of *the whole Chriſtian World of all Ages.* (2.) Since the Evidence is ſo notoriouſly faulty about proving *the* Roman *Church to be the only true Church*, a ſmall Degree of Evidence as to its *Corruptions* may exceed it; and conſequently be ſufficient to keep us from returning to its Communion. But what doth *T. G.* mean by repeating ſuch Stuff as this? Which I dare ſay, Dr. *St.* only paſſed by, on Account of the Slightneſs and Commonneſs of it; they being Arguments every Day brought, and every Day anſwered. And if he had a Mind to ſee Dr. *St.*'s Mind about them, he might have ſeen it at large in his *Defence* of *Archbiſhop Laud*: And do you think it fair for him, every *Book* he writes, to produce afreſh every Argument there, which hath received no Anſwer?

*R. P.* I perceive you begin to be out of Patience.

*P. D.* Not, I aſſure you, when I meet with any thing that deſerves it.

*R. P.* Here comes our *Fanatick Friend* to refreſh you a little. What is the matter, Man; Why ſo ſad? Have you met with an ill Bargain at the *Auction*?

*F. C.* No, no. I got a Book laſt Night, hath taken me up till this time; and truly, I have read ſomething in it which ſits much upon my Spirit.

*R. P.* What is it? If we may ask you.

*F. C.* It is no Comfort either to you, or me.

*R. P.*

*R. P.* If I be concerned, I pray, let me know.

*F. C.* You know laſt Night we heard them at *Rutherford* and *Gilleſpee*; I came in time enough for *Gilleſpee*'s *Miſcellany Queſtions*; a rare Book, I promiſe you. And by a particular Favour I carried it Home with me, and looking upon the *Contents*, I found the *Seaſonable Caſe*, viz. *About Aſſociations and Confederacies with Idolaters, Infidels, or Hereticks*: And he proves them to be ſo abſolutely unlawful from *Scripture*, and many *ſound Orthodox Divines*, that for my Part he hath fully convinced and ſettled me; and I thought it my Duty to come and tell you ſo.

*R. P.* Well, we will let alone that Diſcourſe at preſent, we are at our old Trade again: And I was juſt coming to a ſeaſonable Queſtion for you, viz. *Whether you have not as much Reaſon to ſeparate from the Church of* England, *as the Church of* England *had from the Church of* Rome?

*F. C.* Who doubts of that?

*P. D.* I do, Sir; nay, more, I abſolutely deny it.

*F. C.* What Matter is it, what you ſay or deny? You will do either for a good Preferment. Have not you aſſented and conſented to all that is in the *Book* of *Common Prayer*, and what will you ſtick at after?

*P. D.* Conſider, Sir, what it is *to judge raſh Judgment*: I wonder Men that pretend to Conſcience, and ſeem ſo nice and ſcrupulous in ſome things, can allow themſelves in the Practice of ſo dangerous a Sin. If you have a Mind to debate this Point before us, without Clamor and Impertinency, I am for you.

*F. C.* You would fain draw me into Diſpute again, would you? No ſuch Matter; there is your Man, he will manage our Cauſe for us againſt you of the *Church* of *England*, I warrant you.

*R. P.* I am provided for it: For *T. G.* deſires of Dr. *St. for the Sake of*
Dial.p.78. *the Presbyterians, Anabaptiſts, and other ſeparated Congregations, to know why the believing all the Ancient Creeds, and leading a good Life may not be ſufficient to Salvation, unleſs one be of the Communion of the Church of* England?

*P. D.* A very doughty Queſtion! As though we were like you, and immediately damned all Perſons who are not of the Communion of our Church. We ſay, their Separation from us is very unjuſt and unreaſonable; and that there is no Colour for making their Caſe equal with ours, as to the Separation from the *Church* of *Rome*.

*R. P.* I will tell you of a Man who makes the Caſe Parallel; it is
Dial p.79. one Dr. *St. in his Irenicum:* And *T. G.* produces *many Pages out of him to that Purpoſe.*

*P. D.* To ſave you the Trouble of repeating them, I have read them over, and do think theſe Anſwers may ſerve for his Vindication. (1.) That in that very Place he makes *Separation* from a *Church* retaining Purity of Doctrine, on the Account of ſome corrupt Practices to be *un-*
Iren. p. 117. P. 123. *lawful*; and afterwards in caſe Men be unſatisfied as to ſome Conditions of Communion, he denies it to be lawful to erect *New Churches*; becauſe a mere requiring Conformity in ſome ſuſpected Rites, doth not make a Church otherwiſe ſound, to be no true Church: Or ſuch a Church from which it is lawful to make a total Separation, which is then done, when Men enter into a new and diſtinct Society for Worſhip, under diſtinct and peculiar Officers, governing by *Laws* and *Church Rules* different from thoſe of the *Church* they ſeparate from. And now, let your *Fanatick Friend* judge, whether this Man, even in the Days of writing his *Irenicum*, did juſtifie the Practices of the *ſeparated Congregations*; which he ſpeaks expreſly againſt.

*F. C.*

*F. C.* No truly. We are all now for *ſeparated Congregations*, and know better what we have to do, than our *Forefathers* did. Alas! what Comfort is there in bare Non-conformity? For our People would not endure us, if we did not proceed to *Separation*. He that ſpeaks againſt *Separation* ruins *us* and *our Cauſe*.

*P. D.* So far then we have cleared Dr. *St.* from patronizing the *Cauſe* of the *Separated Congregations*. (2.) He ſaith, that as to things left undetermined by the *Law* of *God* in the *Judgment* of the *Primitive* and *Reformed Churches*, and in Matters of *Order*, *Decency* and *Government*, every one, notwithſtanding what his private Judgment may be of them, is bound to ſubmit to the Determination of the lawful Governors of the Church. Can any thing be ſaid plainer for Conformity, than this is by the *Author* of the *Irenicum*? Iren. p. 124.

*R. P.* But how then come in thoſe Words produced by *T. G.*?

*P. D.* I will tell you: He ſuppoſes that ſome ſcrupulous and conſcientious Men, after all Endeavours uſed to ſatisfy themſelves, may remain unſatisfied as to the *Lawfulneſs* of ſome *impoſed Rites*, but dare not proceed to *poſitive Separation* from the *Church*, but are willing to comply in all other things ſave in thoſe Rites which they ſtill ſcruple; and concerning theſe he puts the Queſtion, Whether ſuch bare Non-Conformity do involve ſuch Men in the Guilt of *Schiſm*? And this I confeſs he reſolves negatively, and ſo brings in that long Paſſage *T. G.* produces out of him. I now appeal to your ſelf, whether *T. G.* hath dealt fairly with Dr. *St.* in Two things, (1.) In not diſtinguiſhing the Caſe of *Separation*, from that of bare *Non-conformity*, only in ſome ſuſpected Rites; and in producing theſe Words to juſtify the *ſeparated Congregations*? (2.) In taking his Judgment in this Matter rather from his *Irenicum* written ſo long ſince, than from his late Writings, wherein he hath purpoſely conſidered the Difference of the *Caſe* of thoſe who ſeparate from the *Church* of *England*, and of our Separation from the *Church* of *Rome*.

*R. P.* But hath he done this indeed? And did *T. G.* know it?

*P. D.* Yes very well. For it is in that very *Book*, the Preface whereof *T. G.* pretends to anſwer in theſe *Dialogues*: And he doth not ſpeak of it by the by, but diſcourſeth largely about it. Is this fair dealing? But the *Irenicum* ſerved better for his Purpoſe as he thought, and yet he hath fouly miſrepreſented that too. *Anſwer to ſeveral Treat. P. 1. from p 180, to 186.*

*R. P.* But yet Dr. *St.* muſt not think to eſcape ſo; for he hath ſearched another *Book* of his, called his *Rational Account*, and there he finds a Paſſage, he thinks, in Favour to *Diſſenters from the Church of* England; and which undermines the *Church* of *England*. Dial p 87.

*P. D.* Therefore the *Church* of *Rome* is not guilty of *Idolatry*.

*R. P.* Have a little Patience; we ſhall come to that in time. At preſent, I pray, clear this Matter, if you can.

*P. D.* To what Purpoſe is all this raking, and ſcraping, and ſearching, and quoting of Paſſages, not at all to the Point of *Idolatry*?

*R. P.* What! would you have a Man do nothing to fill up a Book, and make it carry ſomething of the *Port* of an *Anſwer*; eſpecially to a thick of Book between 800 and 900 Pages?

*P. D.* If this be your Deſign, go on: But I will make my Anſwers as ſhort as I can; for methinks *T. G.* ſeems to have loſt that Spirit and Briskneſs he had before; for then he talked like a Man that had a Mind to keep cloſe to the Point; but now he flags and draws heavily on: For he repeats what he had ſaid before for ſome Pages, and then quotes

out of Dr. *St.*'s other *Books* for several Pages more; and at last it comes to no more than this, Dr. *St.* doth in some Places of his Writings seem to favour the *Dissenters*. I am quite tired with this *Impertinency*; yet I would fain see an End of these things, that we might come close to the Business of *Idolatry*, which I long to be at.

*R. P.* Your Stomach is too sharp set; we must blunt it a little before you fall to.

*P. D.* You take the Course to do it, with all this Impertinency; but what is it you have to say?

*R. P.* To please you, I will bring this Charge as near to the Point of *Idolatry* as I can; the Substance of it is this: Dr. *St.* saith, *The Church of* England *doth not look on her Articles as Articles of Faith, but as inferior Truths*: from thence *T. G.* infers, (1.) *The Church of* Rome *doth not err against any Articles of Faith.* (2.) *Dr.* St. *doth not believe the Thirty nine Articles to be Articles of Faith.* (3.) *Then this Charge of Idolatry is vain and groundless, because Idolatry is an Error against a Fundamental Point of Faith.*

Dial. p. 84, &c.

*P. D.* Here is not one Word new in all this long Charge, but a tedious Repetition of what *T. G.* had said before. It consists of Two Points: 1. The Charge upon Dr. *St.* for *undermining* the *Church* of *England*. 2. The Unreasonableness of the Charge of *Idolatry* upon his own Supposition. Because *T. G.* seems to think there is something in this Business which touched Dr. *St.* to the quick, and therefore he declined giving any Answer to the *First Part* of it; I will undertake to do it for him. Dr. *St.* doth indeed say, That the *Church* of *England* doth not make *her Articles Articles of Faith*, as the *Church* of *Rome* doth the *Articles* of *Pope Pius* the IV. his Creed. And did ever any *Divine* of the *Church* of *England* say otherwise? It is true, the *Church* of *Rome* from her insolent Pretence of Infallibility, doth make all things proposed by the *Church* of equal Necessity to Salvation; because the Ground of *Faith* is the *Churches Authority* in proposing things to be believed. But doth the *Church* of *England* challenge any such *Infallibility* to her self? No: She utterly disowns it, in her very *Articles*; therefore she must leave Matters of Faith as she found them; *i. e.* she receives all the *Creeds* into her *Articles* and *Offices*, but makes no *Additions* to them of her own; and therefore Dr. *St.* did with great Reason say, That the *Church* of *England* makes *no Articles of Faith*, but such as have the *Testimony* and *Approbation* of the *whole Christian World*, and of *all Ages*, and are acknowledged to be such by *Rome* it self; from whence he doth justly magnifie the Moderation of this *Church* in Comparison with the *Church* of *Rome*.

*R. P.* But *T. G.* saith, *That he hath degraded the Articles of the Church of* England *from being Articles of Faith, into a lower Class of inferior Truths.*

*P. D.* I perceive plainly *T. G.* doth not know what an *Article* of *Faith* means according to the Sense of the *Church* of *England*. He looks on all *Propositions* made by the *Church* as *necessary Articles* of *Faith*, which is the *Roman Sense*, and founded on the Doctrine of *Infallibility*; but where the Church's *Infallibility* is rejected, *Articles* of *Faith* are such as have been thought necessary to *Salvation* by the *Consent* of the *Christian World*, which Consent is seen in the *Ancient Creeds*. And whatever Doctrine is not contained therein, though it be received as *Truth*, and agreeable to the *Word* of *God*, yet is not accounted an *Article* of *Faith*:

*i. e.*

*i. e.* not immediately neceſſary to *Salvation* as a Point of Faith. But becauſe of the Diſſentions of the Chriſtian World in Matters of Religion, a particular *Church* may for the Preſervation of her own Peace declare her Senſe as to the *Truth* and *Falſhood* of ſome controverted Points of *Religion*, and require from all Perſons who are entruſted in the *Offices* of that *Church* a *Subſcription* to thoſe *Articles* ; which doth imply, that they agree with the *Senſe* of that *Church* about them.

*R. P.* But Dr. *St.* ſaith from Archbiſhop *Bramhall*, *That the Church doth not oblige any Man to believe them, but only not to contradict them* ; and upon this *T. G. triumphs* over Dr. *St. as undermining the Doctrine and Government of the Church of* England.

*P. D.* Why not over Archbiſhop *Bramhall*, whoſe Words Dr. *St.* cites? And was he a *Favourer of Diſſenters*, and an *Underminer of the Church of* England ? Yet Dr. *St.* himſelf in that Place owns a *Subſcription* to them as neceſſary ; and what doth *Subſcription* imply leſs than *agreeing* with the *Senſe* of the *Church* : So that he ſaith more than Archbiſhop *Bramhall* doth. And I do not ſee how his Words can paſs, but with this Conſtruction, that when he ſaith, *we do not oblige any Man to believe them*, he means as *Articles* of *Faith*, of which he ſpeaks juſt before. But I do freely yield, that the *Church* of *England* doth require *Aſſent* to the *Truth* of thoſe *Propoſitions* which are contained in the XXXIX Articles: And ſo doth Dr. *St.* when he ſaith, *The Church requires Subſcription to them as Inferior Truths*, *i. e.* owning them to be *true Propoſitions*, though not as *Articles* of *Faith*, but *Articles* of *Religion*, as our *Church* calls them.

*R. P. If they are but Inferior Truths*, ſaith *T. G. was it worth the while to rend aſunder the Peace of Chriſtendom for them ? Is not this a very reaſonable Account, as* J. S. *calls it, of the Grounds of the Proteſtant Religion, and a rare way of juſtifying her from the Guilt of Schiſm* ?

*P. D. T. G.* miſtakes the Matter. It was not our impoſing *Negative Points* on others, but the *Church* of *Rome*'s impoſing falſe and abſurd Doctrines for *neceſſary Articles of Faith*, which did break the *Peace* of *Chriſtendom*. We could have no Communion with the *Church* of *Rome* unleſs we owned her *Supremacy*, her *Canon* of *Scripture*, her *Rule* of *Faith*, or the Equality of *Tradition* and *Scripture*, her Doctrines of *Purgatory*, *Invocation* of *Saints*, *Worſhip* of *Images*, *Tranſubſtantiation*, &c. and we were required not only to own them as *true*, which we know to be *falſe*; but as *neceſſary* to *Salvation*, which we look on as *great Hinderances* to it. What was to be done in this Caſe ? Communion could not be held on other Terms, than declaring falſe Opinions to be true, and dangerous Doctrines to be neceſſary to Salvation. On ſuch Terms as theſe we muſt renounce our Chriſtianity, to declare, That we believed Falſhoods for Truths, and not barely as Truths, but as neceſſary Articles of Faith. Therefore what *Schiſm* there was, the *Church* of *Rome* muſt thank her ſelf for. And when this Breach hapned, our Church thought it neceſſary to expreſs her Senſe of theſe Doctrines, that they were ſo far from being *Articles* of *Faith*, that they were *Falſe* and *Erroneous*, having no Foundation either in *Scripture* or *Antiquity* : And required a *Subſcription* to this Declaration, from ſuch as are admitted to teach and inſtruct others. How could our *Church* do leſs than ſhe did in this Matter, if ſhe would declare her Senſe to the World, or take care of her own Security ? And is this making *Negative Articles* of *Faith* ; about which *T. G.* and *E. W.* and others, have made ſuch ſenſeleſs Clamours ? When we only declare

those things they would impose upon us, to be so far from being *Articles* of *Faith*, that they are Erroneous Doctrines; and therefore are rejected by us. And this I take to be a *Reasonable Account* of the *Protestant Religion*; which is more than *J. S.* hath given to those of his own *Church* of his *Demonstrations*.

*R. P. But since Dr.* St. *grants the Church of* Rome *to hold all the Essential Points of Faith, how can he charge her with Idolatry, since Idolatry is an Error against the most Fundamental Point of Faith?* I pray Answer to this, for this comes home to the Business.

*P. D.* I am glad to see you but coming that way. To this Dr. *St.* hath already given a full and clear Answer, in his late *Defence*.

Defence, p. 187, &c. (1.) He saith, by the *Church of* Rome's *holding all Essential Points of Faith*, no more is meant than that she owns and receives all the *Ancient Creeds*.

(2.) *T. G.* grants, *That Idolatry is giving the Worship due to God to a Creature*. If therefore a Church holding the Essential Points of Faith may give the Worship due to God to a Creature, then there is no Contradiction between saying the *Church* of *Rome* holds all the *Essential Points of Faith*, and yet charging it with *Idolatry*. Because *Idolatry* is a *Practical Error*, and therefore may be consistent with holding all the Doctrinal Points of *Faith*; no more being necessary to it, as Dr. *St.* proves, than entertaining a false Notion of Divine Worship, by which Means it may really give God's Worship to a Creature, and yet be very Orthodox in holding that God's Worship ought not to be given to a Creature.

Dial p 92. *R. P. T. G.* was aware of this Answer, and thus he takes it off. *To err*, he saith, *strictly speaking, is to teach that which is opposite to Truth; but if the Church of* Rome *teaches, that the Worship she gives to Saints and Images is not a part of the Honour due to God, and yet it is; then she errs against the Second Commandment, though she judges she doth not.*

*P. D.* What is this to the Purpose? The Question is not whether *Idolatry* doth not imply a *Practical Error* against the Second Commandment; but whether it be consistent with the *Doctrinal Points of Faith*, such as are *Essential* to the *Being* of a *Church*? For of this sort of *Errors*, all the Dispute was, as is plain from Dr. *St.*'s Words, which gave Occasion to this Objection.

*R. P. But is it not a Fundamental Error to destroy the Doctrine of the Second Commandment?*

*P. D.* If it be, The more Care had they need to have who put it out of their Books, that it may not fly in their Faces. But who ever reckoned the *Commandments* among the *Articles* of *Faith*? I do not deny it to be a very dangerous *Practical Error* to destroy the *Doctrine* of the *Second Commandment*; or rather to take away the whole *Force* of the *Precept*; but I say, this is none of those *Essential Points* of *Faith* which Dr. *St.* spake of; and therefore this is no Answer to him.

Dial. p. 94. *R. P.* Therefore *T. G.* adds, *That this doth not proceed upon a general Thesis, whether some Idolatrous Practice may not consist with owning the general Principles of Faith; but upon a particular Hypothesis, whether the Worship of God by an Image, be not an Error against the Doctrine of the Second Commandment, if that be to forbid Men to worship him by an Image? And therefore if it be a Fundamental Point to believe that to be Idolatry which God hath expressly forbidden in the Law under the Notion of Idolatry, and that be the Worshipping of him by an Image, as* Dr. St. *asserts; 'tis clear that*

*that the Church of* Rome *in telling Men it is not Idolatry, errs againſt a Fundamental Point; and he cannot according to his Principles, maintain his Charge of Idolatry without a Contradiction.*

*P. D.* This is then the thing to be tried; and therefore we muſt judge of it by what Dr. *St.* ſaid, to which this is ſuppoſed to be a *Contradiction.* Did he ever ſay, that the *Church* of *Rome* did not err againſt the *Doctrine* of the *Second Commandment*? Nay, he hath invincibly proved it hath. I ſay *invincibly*, ſince *T. G.* gives it up in theſe *Dialogues*; ſpending ſo many Pages upon the Repetition of his old Arguments, and paſſing over all that Elaborate Diſcourſe of Dr. *St. about the Senſe of the Second Commandment*, on which the Hinge of the *Controverſy* depends. If then Dr. *St.* doth charge them with a very dangerous and pernicious Error in reſpect of this *Commandment*, that could not be the *Fundamental Error* he cleared the *Church* of *Rome* from, when he ſaid, *ſhe held all Eſſential Points of Faith*, (mark that) and he explained himſelf purpoſely to prevent ſuch a Miſtake, to mean ſuch *Doctrinal Points of Faith* as are *Eſſential* to the *Conſtitution* of a *Church*, and the *true Form* of *Baptiſm*; now the Queſtion is, Whether it be a Contradiction for a Man to ſay, that the *Church* of *Rome* doth hold all theſe *Eſſential Points of Faith*, and yet is guilty of *Idolatry*? And how after all, hath *T. G.* proved it? *It is a Fundammental Point*, ſaith he, *to believe that to be Idolatry which God hath forbidden as Idolatry*; and ſo it is to believe that to be Perjury, and Theft and Adultery, which God hath forbidden under their Notion. But will any Man ſay the true Notion of *Adultery* is a *Doctrinal Point of Faith*? Altho' therefore it be granted, that the *Church* of *Rome* do err *fundamentally* againſt the *2d Commandment*; yet that doth not prove Dr. *St.* guilty of a *Contradiction*, becauſe he ſpake not of *Practical Errors*, but of the *Doctrinal* and *Eſſential Points of Faith.* And now I hope we have done with all theſe *Preliminaries*, and may come to the Point of *Idolatry* it ſelf.

*R. P.* Hold a little, you are ſtill too quick; I have ſomething more yet to ſay to you before we come to it.

*P. D.* What is that?

*R. P.* I have a great deal to tell you out of *Mr.* Thorndike's *Juſt Weights and Meaſures*, about the *Charge* of *Idolatry*, and the *miſchievous Conſequences of it.* Dial. from p. 99. to p. 113.

*P. D.* To what End ſhould you repeat all that? I begin to think you were not in Jeſt, when you ſaid *T. G.* put in ſome things to fill up his Book. Dr. *St.* had before declared the great Eſteem he had for Mr. *Thorndike's Learning and Piety*; but in this particular, he declared, that he ſaw no Reaſon to recede from the common Doctrine of the *Church* of *England*, on the Account of Mr. *Thorndike's Authority*, or *Arguments.* And I have already given you ſuch an Account of his Opinion with reſpect to the *Church* of *Rome*, as I hope will take off Mr. *Thorndike's Teſtimonies* being ſo often alledged againſt us by *T. G.* and his Brethren. If *T. G.* had not purpoſely declined the main Matters in Debate between Dr. *St.* and him, he would never have ſtuffed out ſo much of his Book with things ſo little Material to that which ought to have been the main Deſign of it.

*R. P.* But I have ſomewhat more to ſay to you, which is, *That you charge* T. G. *with declining the Diſpute about the Senſe of the Second Commandment*, whereas he doth ſpeak particularly to it. Dial. p. 116.

*P. D.* I am glad to hear it; I hope then he takes off the Force of what Dr. *St.* had said in his late *Defence* about it. For I assure you it was much expected from him.

*R. P.* What would you have a Man do? he produces at least four Leaves of what he had said before: And then a little after, near two Leaves more: And within a few Pages, above two Leaves again out of his old Book; and then tells how Dr. *St.* spends above an 100 Pages about the Sense of the Second Commandment, *whereas he neither removes the Contradictions, nor answers the Arguments of* T. G., *but criticizeth upon the Exceptions of* T. G. *to the several Methods for finding out the Sense of the Law*; but, saith he, *what need so much Pains and Labour be taken, if the Law be express*; and do not you think this enough about the Second Commandment?

Dial. *from p.* 116. *to* 120. *p.* 121, 122. *p.* 127.

*P. D.* No truly. Nor you neither, upon any Consideration. For the Dr. in his Discourse upon the Second Commandment, (1) hath manifestly overthrown *T. G.*'s Notion of an *Idol*, viz *of a Figment set up for Worship*, by such clear and convincing Arguments, that if *T. G.* had any thing to have said in Defence of it, he would never have let it escaped thus. (2.) * He hath proved the Sense he gives of the Commandment to be the same which the *Fathers* gave of it. (3.) † He takes off *T. G.*'s Instances of *worshipping before the Ark and the Cherubims*; and the * *Testimony* of *S. Austin*. (4.) † He answers *T. G.*'s Objections and clears the *Sense* of the Law by all the Means a Law can be well understood. And is all this, do you think, answered by *T. G.*'s repeating what he had said before; or blown down by a Puff or Two of Wit? I do not know what *T. G.* thinks of it; but I do not find any understanding Man takes this for an Answer, but a mere Put-off. So that I may well say, Dr. *St.*'s Proofs are *invincible*, when *T. G.* so shamefully retreats out of the Field, and sculks under some Hedges and Thorns which he had planted before, for a Shelter in time of Need.

Defence, *from p.* 673. *to p.* 692. (*) *From p.* 692. *to p.* 698. (†) *From p.* 702. *to p.* 717. (*) *From p.* 117. *to p.* 720. (†) *From p.* 720. *to p.* 784.

*R. P.* But why did not Dr. *St.* answer punctually to all that *T. G.* said?

*P. D.* Because he did not think it material, if the main things were proved.

*R. P.* But *T. G.* will think them unanswerable, till he receive Satisfaction concerning them.

*P. D.* That it may be is impossible to give a Man, that hath no Mind to receive it; but if you please, let me hear the Strength of what *T. G.* lays such Weight upon, that he may have no such Pretence for the Future; and lest the Third time we meet with the same Coleworts.

*R. P. Doth not Dr.* St. *make express Scripture his most certain Rule of Faith? Doth not he on the other Side deny any thing to be an Article of Faith, which is not acknowledged to be such by* Rome *it self. Then if God hath expressly forbidden the Worship of himself by an Image, it is an Article of Faith, that he ought not to be worshipped by an Image; and since* Rome *doth not acknowledge it, it is not an Article of Faith. Therefore* T. G. *calls upon the Dr. to speak out. Is it, or is it not an Article of Faith?* But *T. G.* saith, *He hath found out the Mystery of the Business* (for he can find out *Mysteries*, I assure you, as well as *discover Plots*, and *catch Moles*) *to gratify the Non-conformists, the Articles of the Church of* England *must pass only for inferior Truths; but when the Church of* Rome *is to be charged with Idolatry, then they are Articles of Faith*: So that as *T. G.* pleasantly saith, *The same Proposition taken Irenically is an inferior Truth, but taken Polemically it must be an Article of Faith, because expressly revealed in Scripture.*

Dial. p. 116, 117.

*P. D.* Is

*P. D.* Is this it which *T. G.* thought worth repeating at large? Surely it was for the Sake of the Clinch of *Irenically* and *Polemically*, and not for any Shew of Difficulty in the thing. For all the Miſt is eaſily ſcattered by obſerving a very plain Diſtinction of an *Article* of *Faith*; which is either taken, 1. For an *eſſential Point of Faith*, ſuch as is antecedently neceſſary to the Being of a Chriſtian Church; and ſo the *Creed* is ſaid to contain the *Articles* of our *Faith*; and in this Senſe Dr. *St. ſaid the Church of* Rome *did hold all the eſſential Points of Faith*, which we did. 2. For any Doctrine plainly revealed in *Scripture*, which is our *Rule* of *Faith*. And did Dr. *St.* ever deny, That the *Church* of *Rome* oppoſed ſome things clearly revealed in *Scripture*? Nay, it is the Deſign of his *Books* to prove it doth. And if every Doctrine which can be deduced from a plain Command of *Scripture*, is to be looked on as an *Article* of *Faith*, then, *That the Cup is to be given to thoſe who partake of the Bread*, that *Prayers are to be in a known Tongue*, will become *Articles* of *Faith*; and do you think Dr. *St.* either *Irenically* or *Polemically*, did ever yield, that the *Church* of *Rome* did not oppoſe theſe? If *T. G.* lays ſo much Weight on ſuch ſlight things as theſe, I muſt tell you, he is not the Man I took him for; and I believe it was only Civility in Dr. *St.* to paſs ſuch things by.

*R. P.* But *T. G.* would know, *what he means by expreſly forbidden, only that it is clear to himſelf, expecting that others ſhould ſubmit to his ſaying it, as the Travellers did to* Polus *in* Eraſmus; *or that it is clear or manifeſt of it ſelf? And that it is not ſo*, he ſaith, *appears by the Pains and Ways he takes to find it out.* Dial. p. 121.

*P. D.* This is yet a Degree lower. By *clearly and expreſly*, Dr. *St.* means that which is ſo to *an unprejudiced Mind.* For there is nothing ſo plain, but Men may cavil at it. Not the *Being* of *God*; not the *Certainty* of our *Senſes*; not the *Differences* of *Good* and *Evil*; not the Coming of the *Meſſias*; not the Truth of the *Scriptures*. But will *T. G.* ſay, That none of theſe are *clear*, becauſe Men are put to Pains and ſeveral ways to prove them? If therefore Dr. *St.* hath ſhewed, that all the Evaſions of the Force of the *Second Commandment* are mere Cavils, and would take off as well the Force of any other Commandment, if Men thought themſelves as much concerned to do it; I think he hath proved the *Senſe* of the Commandment to be clear and expreſs againſt the *Worſhip* of *God* by an *Image*. And for his *Friend Polus*, you know it doth not look well in Converſation for a Man to repeat his own Jeſts. But you named a Third Paſſage *T. G.* repeats out of his former Book. What is that, I pray?

*R. P.* That concerns Dr. *St.*'s *Firſt way of finding out the Senſe of the Law*: *For*, he ſaith, *the Law doth only expreſly forbid bowing down to the Images themſelves as the Heathens did; but ſpeaks not One Word of the Lawfulneſs, or Unlawfulneſs of worſhipping God himſelf by them*; and upon this he upbraids Dr. *St.* that ſpending above a Hundred Pages about the *Senſe* of the *Second Commandment*, *he neither endeavours to remove the Contradictions, nor to anſwer the Arguments of* T. G. Dial. p. 125.

*P. D.* Then truly he deſerved Pity, and to have his Friends come in to help him, they are ſuch *wonderful Contradictions* and *mighty Arguments*. But Dr. *St.* hath at large proved, (1.) That the *Heathens* did not take the *Images* themſelves for *Gods*, in a large Diſcourſe to that Purpoſe, and conſequently this Command was not expreſs againſt the *Heathen Idolatry* in *T. G.*'s Senſe of it. (2.) That the *Fathers* did underſtand this Com- *Defence* p. 465, &c.

Commandment to be *expreſly* againſt the *Worſhip of God by an Image*; in another large Diſcourſe, which he concludes with thoſe Words of St. *Ambroſe*, *Non vult ſe Deus in lapidibus coli*, *God will not be worſhipped in Stones*. And is this nothing to the anſwering *T. G.*'s Arguments? (3.) That the *Worſhip of God before the Ark and the Cherubims* (the only Argument of *T. G.*) doth not reach to the *Worſhip* of *God* by *Images*; and this in another ſet Diſcourſe. (4.) That God did afterwards explain his own Law, by condemning the *Worſhip* of himſelf by *Images*; in the caſe of the *Golden Calf*, and the *Calves* of *Dan* and *Bethel*, and he punctually anſwers *T. G.*'s Objections. And after all this, Is it not great Tenderneſs and Modeſty in *T. G.* to ſay, *That Dr.* St. *only criticizeth upon* T. G.*'s Exceptions, and doth neither remove the Contradictions, nor anſwer the Arguments of* T. G.? I never yet ſaw plainer Evidence of a forlorn Cauſe, than theſe things give. By this Taſte, I begin to fear, when we come to the Charge of *Idolatry*, we ſhall find very little new, or material. However, being thus far engaged, I am reſolved, God willing, to attend you quite through his *late Dialogues*; and if you pleaſe at our next meeting, we will enter upon the *Charge* of *Idolatry*, and I will undertake to make good the *Charge*, and I ſhall expect from you *T. G.*'s Anſwers.

*From p.* 419. *to p.* 431.

*From p.* 702. *to p.* 717.

*From p.* 748. *to p.* 783.

*R. P.* I will not fail; and I pray *Brother Fanatick*, let us have your Company, for I have a terrible Charge againſt the *Church* of *England* for *bowing to the Altar*.

*F. C.* I ſhall be glad to hear that with all my heart.

*The End of the Second Conference.*

THE

THE

# Third Conference,

## *About the Nature of* IDOLATRY.

*P. D.* WE are now entring upon a weighty Buſineſs; and therefore without any Preface to it, I begin. Dr. *St.* in his late *Defence* hath undertaken to clear the *Nature* of *Idolatry*, by conſidering Two things. 1. Whether it were conſiſtent with the Acknowledgment of One *Supreme God*? 2. Wherein the *Nature* of that *Divine Worſhip* lies, which being given to a *Creature* makes it *Idolatry*?

1. To clear the former, he conſidered, who thoſe are, which by common Conſent are charged with *Idolatry*, and from thence he ſuppoſed the beſt Reſolution of the Queſtion might be gathered; and thoſe were, (1.) The *Ancient Heathens*, (2.) *Modern Heathens*, (3.) The *Arians*. And concerning theſe, he proved, That they did all acknowledge One *Supreme God*; and conſequently the *Notion* of *Idolatry* could not conſiſt in the Worſhip of many independent *Deities*.

(1.) As to the *Ancient Heathens*. (1.) From the *Teſtimony* of *Scripture*. (2.) From their own *Writers* in the *Roman Church*, of whom he names Twelve conſiderable Ones. (3.) From the *Fathers*; and there he ſhews from a multitude of plain Teſtimonies, that the *State* of the *Controverſie* about *Idolatry* between the *Fathers* and *Heathens*, was not about a *Supreme God* which was acknowledged on both ſides, but whether Divine Worſhip were to be given to any Creatures on the Account of any ſuppoſed Excellency in themſelves, or Relation to God? And ſo he draws the Hiſtory of this Controverſy through the ſeveral Ages of *Juſtin Martyr*, *Athenagoras*, *Clemens* of *Alexandria*, *Origen*, *Cyril*, *S. Auguſtin*, &c. In ſhort, through all thoſe, who did with greateſt Reputation to *Chriſtianity* manage this Cauſe againſt the *Heathen Idolaters*.

(2.) As to *Modern Heathens*; Two Ways. (1.) From the *Teſtimony* of your own *Writers* concerning the *Brachmans*, *Chineſes*, *Tartars*, *Americans*, *Africans*, *Goths* and *Laplanders*. (2.) From the Teſtimony of the *Congregation* of *Cardinals* in a remarkable Caſe about *Idolatry* in *China*, wherein their Reſolution was deſired.

(3.) As to the *Arians*; he proves from *Athanaſius*, *Gr. Nazianzen*, *Nyſſen*, *Baſil*, *Epiphanius*, *Cyril*, *Theoderet*, *S. Chryſoſtom*, *S. Ambroſe*, *S. Auguſtin*, That the *Arians* were unanimouſly charged with *Idolatry*; although they did acknowledge but one God, and ſuppoſed the greateſt created Excellencies to be in Chriſt, and believed the Worſhip of Chriſt tended to the Honour of the Father.

2. As to the *Nature* of *Divine Worſhip*: He proceeds in this Method.

1. To ſhew what *Worſhip* is; which he diſtinguiſhes from *Honour*, the One relating to bare *Excellency*, the Other to *Superiority* and *Power*; which Diſtinction he proves from the moſt Eminent *School Divines*.

2. What *Divine Worſhip* is; *viz.* ſuch a Subjection of our ſelves to God as ſhews his peculiar *Sovereignty* over us: From whence he proceeds to manifeſt, That there are ſome *peculiar external Acts of Divine Worſhip*, which he proves, (1.) From the *Nature* and *Deſign* of *Religious Worſhip*; and here he enquires into the Diſtinction of *Civil* and *Religious Worſhip*; which, he ſaith, as other moral Actions, is to be taken from the *Circumſtances* of them; and from hence came the Inſtitution of ſolemn Rites for Religious Worſhip. And the beſt *Divines* of the *Roman Church* do allow; That there ought to be ſome peculiar external Acts of Divine Worſhip; which he likewiſe proves from the infinite Diſtance between God and his Creatures; and from the remarkable Teſtimonies of the *Heathens* to that Purpoſe.

(2.) From *God's appropriating ſome external Acts* of *Worſhip* to himſelf; wherein he ſpeaks to Two things:

1. What thoſe *Acts* are which God hath appropriated to himſelf; of which he reckons up Six.

1. Sacrifice. 2. Religious Adoration. 3. Erection of Temples and Altars. 4. Burning of Incenſe. 5. Solemn Invocation. 6. Vows.

2. How far *God's* appropriating theſe *Acts* doth concern us? Which he thus reſolves. 1. It is granted there muſt be ſome peculiar Acts. 2. God is the beſt Judge of them. 3. What he hath once appropriated cannot be made common till his Will be declared. 4. *Chriſt* hath made no Alteration herein by his Law. 5. The Apoſtles ſuppoſe the ſame *Notion* of *Idolatry* to continue ſtill. 6. The *Jews* did eſteem it *Idolatry* to uſe thoſe *Acts* of *Worſhip* towards any *Creature*. Where he ſhews, That *Idolatry* may be committed as many ways, as Worſhip may become due to *God*.

(3.) From the Senſe of the *Chriſtian Church*; which hath condemned thoſe for *Idolatry*, who have applied theſe appropriate *Acts* of *Worſhip* to any thing beſides God.

3. How the applying the *Acts* of *Religious Worſhip* to a Creature makes that Worſhip *Idolatry*? Where he explains,

1. What real *Honour* we do allow to the *Saints* on the Account of their Excellencies.

2. What Worſhip we deny to them. (1.) *Inward Submiſſion* of our *Souls* in *Prayer*, *Dependance*, and *Thankſgiving*. (2.) *External* and *Solemn Acts* of *Religious Worſhip*, which are given to *Saints* in the *Church* of *Rome*: And he proves from unqueſtionable *Teſtimonies* of *Antiquity*, That the *Fathers* did deny to be given to them. And ſo he concludes that *Diſcourſe* with a full and clear Explication of a *Teſtimony* of S. *Auguſtin* againſt *Invocation* of *Saints*.

This is a brief *Abſtract* of the *Deſign* of Dr. *St.*'s Diſcourſe concerning the *Nature* of *Idolatry*; whoſe Parts are too well conſider'd, and put together, to be blown down with a Puff or two of Wit. Let me now hear how *T. G.* hath acquitted himſelf in this matter, which we ſhall the better judge of, by having this *Scheme* before us.

*R. P.* I perceive you expect *T. G.* ſhould have followed Dr. *St.*'s Method, and have anſwered him part by part; but he was wiſer than ſo; for he charges him with Three things. (1.) *That he makes vain, and endleſs, and unneceſſary Diſcourſes.* (2.) *That he ought to have laid down the true Notion of Idolatry from the Nature of the thing, which he hath not done.* (3.) *That he hath unfaithfully reported the Words and Senſe of Authors.* After which, he diſproves *the Parallel between the Heathen and Romiſh Idolatry.*

*R. P.*

*P. D* This laſt, if you pleaſe, we will reſerve to another Conference ; for I believe the other Three, will hold us long enough. I pray begin where *T. G.* doth.

*R.P.* Firſt, *He complains much of the Bulk of the Book* ; and brings in a kind of a *Taylor's Bill* of the Number of Pages : Imp. of *T. G.*'s *Notion* of *Idolatry*, *p.* 183. It. *Of the Nature of Divine Worſhip*, *p.* 164. It. *Of the Controverſy about Images between Chriſtians and Heathens*, *p.* 140. It. *Of Images in the Chriſtian Church*, *p.* 180. odd. It. *Of the Senſe of the Second Commandment*, *p.* 113. It. *Of Inſtances*, and facings and linings, p. 96. *Sum. tot. p.* 877. Was not this enough to put any Man out of Humour ? Dial. p. 167, 171, 172.

*P. D.* No doubt ; when he conſidered he was to pay it all. And I do believe what he ſaith, *that he was very uneaſy when he read it* ; and like the *Laconian* in *Boccalini*, *who was condemned to read over* Guicciardines *War of* Piſa *: And deſired rather to be condemned to the Gallies.* For there is nothing more troubleſome to a Man than to ſee that he owes more than he is ever able to pay.

*R. P.* But *T. G.* ſhews how much of the *Bill* might have been cut off.

*P. D.* The ſhorteſt way had been to have thrown all into the Fire, as no doubt he would have done, if it had been in his Power ; and that had been the moſt effectual *Diſcharge to Dr.* St.*'s Charge of Idolatry.* But do you think, it is a good Anſwer to an Indictment, to ſay it conſiſted of too many Lines ?

*R. P. T. G.* ſaith he ought to have proceeded more *Mathematically* ?

*P. D.* How ſo ?

*R. P. By laying down only theſe Four* Poſtulata. 1. *That Idolatry may conſiſt with the Acknowledgment of one Supreme Being.* 2. *That God ought to be worſhipped according to his own Appointment.* 3. *That the Wiſer Heathens pretended they did not look on their Images as Gods, but as Symbols of that Being to which they gave Divine Worſhip.* 4. *That for the Four firſt Centuries, there was little or no Uſe of Images in the Temples and Oratories of Chriſtians.* Which as far as I underſtand *T. G.* he was willing to have granted him. Dial. p. 173.

*P. D.* Are you ſure of that ? If theſe things be fairly granted, they will go a great way toward the Reſolution of the preſent Queſtion. But I pray let me underſtand how far, and in what Senſe ?

*R. P.* For the firſt, *That Idolatry may conſiſt with the Acknowledgment of one Supreme Being :* I perceive *T. G.* puts this Limitation to it, *at leaſt as Idolatry is taken by Dr.* St. *for the giving External Acts of Worſhip due only to God, to a Creature.* Dial. p. 174.

*P. D.* Let us then lay up this at preſent, that *real Idolatrous Worſhip* is conſiſtent with the Acknowledgment of one *Supreme God* ; which may be of Uſe to us in this Debate.

*R. P.* For the ſecond, *T. G.* ſaith, *That it is no where denied, but is ſuppoſed by him, when he ſaith, that if God have forbidden himſelf to be worſhipped after ſuch a manner, the giving him ſuch Worſhip will be diſhonouring of him, though the Giver intend it never ſo much for his Honour, much more then, the giving Acts of Worſhip appropriated to him to another.* Dial. p. 175.

*P. D.* This is very kind. For then if it appear, that *God* hath forbidden the Worſhip of himſelf by an *Image*, it follows that no *Intention* of the Perſon can excuſe ſuch Worſhip from *Idolatry.*

*R. P.* For the third, *concerning the Practice of the Wiser Heathens*, T. G. allows *the Doctor to make his best of it.*

*P. D.* Then there may be *Idolatrous Worship* of *Images*, where the *Images themselves* are not made the *Objects* of *Worship*; and consequently if such Worship be forbidden in the Second Commandment, that cannot be understood only of *Bowing down to the Images themselves.*

Dial. p. 176, &c.

*R. P.* For the fourth, he saith, *since the Church hath a Power in decreeing Rites and Ceremonies, it had been no Prejudice to his Cause, if it had been longer before the Use of Images was brought into Churches:*

*P. D.* If the Church had looked on the *Worship* of *Images* as an indifferent Rite, there had been some Reason for what *T. G.* saith: But the Force of what Dr. *St.* said, lay not merely in their having *no Images* in *Churches in the Primitive Times*; but in the *Reasons* given by the *Primitive Christians* against the *Worship* of them. From whence he hath at large proved, that the *Primitive Christians* did look on the *Worship* of *Images* as utterly unlawful by the Law of God, altho' the Object represented did deserve Worship. And this I take to be one of the most material *Discourses* in Dr. *St*'s Book, to the present Controversy, and which he lays the greatest Weight upon. For he insists upon these several particulars. (1.) * That they judged such a Representation of *God* by *Images* to be unsuitable to his *Nature*; for which he produceth the *Testimonies* of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Justin Martyr*, *Athenagoras*, *Origen*, St. *Hierom*, St. *Augustin* and others. (2.) † That they looked on the *Worship* of *Images* as repugnant to the *Will* of *God*; as being contrary to the *Second Commandment*, which did oblige Christians. (3.) * That to suppose that they looked on the *Worship* of *Images* as a thing *indifferent*, is to charge the *Primitive Christians* with great *Hypocrisy*. (4.) † That the *Christian Church* continued to have the same Opinion about the *Worship* of *Images* after the *Pagan Idolatry* was suppressed. (5.) * That it was no just Excuse in the Sense of the Primitive Church, that they worshipped a *true Object*, or gave only an *Inferior Worship* to the *Images*, for the Sake of those represented by them. (6.) † That *Ignorance* and *Superstition* first brought in the Worship of *Images*, which was still condemned by the best *Divines* of the Church. (7.) * That the Worship of *Images* came to be established in the *Church* by very indirect Means; such as Treason, Calumnies, Lies, and burning and suppressing all Books against it. (8.) † That when it was established by the Second *Council* of *Nice*, it was vehemently opposed by the *Western Church* at the *Council* of *Franckford*: And that this *Council* of *Nice* was never owned in the *Western Church* for a *General Council* till the *Reformation* began.

* P. 149. to p. 428.

†Defence, p. 428. &c. p. 490. &c.

* P. 494. &c.

† P. 497. to p. 505.

* P. 506. to p. 521.

† P. 503. &c.

* P. 538. to p. 555.

† P. 812. to p. 840.

And now I pray was it possible for *T. G.* to overlook all these things? Or was it fair to pretend to answer Dr. *St.*'s Book, wherein all these things are, and yet to pass them over, as if they had never been written? If this be the way of making *Just Discharges*, I am afraid *T. G.*'s Credit cannot hold out long; for this is not after the Rate of Five Shillings in the Pound: And for all that I see, Dr. *St.* may take out the *Statute* against him. However, I shall consider what he pretends to *Discharge*, and if his *Payment* be not good in that neither, his Word will hardly be taken for any *Just Discharge* more. I pray go on.

Dial. p. 177.

*R. P.* For the fifth Chapter, *Of the Sense of the Second Commandment*, T. G. saith, *if God hath there expressly prohibited the giving any Worship to himself by an Image, as Dr. St. affirms, there needed no more than to expose the Law as in a Table in Legislative* Gothick (*as it is done by him*, p. 671.)

671.) *with the Addition only of a Finger in the Margin to Point to the Words, for every one that runs to read them.*

*P. D.* And muſt this paſs for an Anſwer to Dr. *St.*'s Diſcourſe about the Senſe of the Second Commandment? I am really aſhamed of ſuch trifling in a Matter of ſo great Importance. I know not whether it were the *Legiſlative Gothick* or no, or a *Finger on the Wall*, but ſomething or other about that *Commandment* hath ſo affrighted you in the *Church* of *Rome*, that you dare not let it be ſeen in your *Ordinary Books* of *Devotion*. As for the Cavil about *expreſly*, I have anſwer'd it already.

*R. P.* For his laſt Chapter, *T. G.* ſaith, *There needed no more than to ſay, that the Church of* England *doth not allow any Worſhip to be given to the Altar.* Dial. p. 179.

*P. D.* Is it poſſible for *T. G.* to think to fob us off with ſuch Anſwers as theſe? barely to tell his Adverſary, he might have ſpared this and the other Diſcourſe.

*R. P.* But *T. G.* ſaith, *this is the moſt material thing in that Chapter.*

*P. D.* Say you ſo? Was the wiſe *Council* of *Nice* ſo immaterial a thing, that it muſt now be quite abandoned, and no kind of *Diſcharge* be ſo much as offered to be made for it? Was there nothing material in what concerns the Charge of *Contradictions*, *Paradoxes*, *School-Diſputes*, *&c.*? And all the other *Inſtances* waved to come to this of *Bowing to the Altar*? There muſt be ſome *Myſtery* in this; and I think I have found it: The *Patronus bonæ fidei* inveighs bitterly againſt this, as worſe than *Egyptian Idolatry*, and reproaches Dr. *St.* upon account of his defending it: And *T. G.* finds it much eaſier to reproach than to anſwer.

*R. P.* The truth is, this *Patronus bonæ fidei* doth *T. G.* Knight's-Service: For when he hath no mind to appear himſelf, he ſerves him for a Knight of the Poſt, who runs Blindfold upon any thing that may diſcredit the *Church* of *England*; Two or Three ſuch rare Men would eaſe us of a great deal of Trouble. For *T. G.* takes between Five and Six Pages together out of him in this Place, beſides what he hath taken up at Intereſt upon other Occaſions. Dial. p. 182. to 187.

*P. D.* Is this the *Juſt Diſcharge*, to borrow ſo much out of the Fanatick Stock? Setting then aſide what is brought over of the old Account, which had been reckoned for before; and how very many material things are never entred, which he was accountable for; and how much he hath borrowed upon the *Bona Fides* of the Fanatick Hiſtorian, all the Reſt will amount to a very pitiful Diſcharge. But ſince no better Payment can be had, let us at leaſt examine this: For this *Bona Fides* is a kind of *Republican Publick Faith*, which no body will truſt twice, not ſo much as for *Bodkins* and *Thimbles*.

*F. C.* Hold Sir. You love always to be rubbing upon old Sores; have you forgot the *Act* of *Oblivion*? You know we dare not ſpeak what we think of thoſe Times now; and is that fair to accuſe when we dare not anſwer? Mind your own Buſineſs, defend the *Church* of *England* if you can, in that *Idolatrous Practice* of *Bowing to the Altar*. I always thought what it would come to, when Dr. *St.* went about the *Charge* of *Idolatry* upon the Principles of the *Church* of *England*; I knew he could never defend himſelf but upon good Orthodox Fanatick Principles, as you call them. Now Sir, you have him at an Advantage, join your Force and *T. G.*'s with that of the *Patronus bonæ Fidei*, and if the Geeſe follow the Fox cloſe, you will keep him from ever ſtirring more.

*P. D.*

*P. D.* I thank you for your good Will to the Cauſe, and that is all I fear from you; you only add to the Number, and help to preſerve the *Roman Capitol* by your *Noiſe.*

*R. P.* You ſhall not eſcape thus; what ſay you *to Bowing to the Altar*, is not that as great *Idolatry*, as *Worſhip* of *Images?*

*P. D.* Do you not remember the Anſwer Dr. *St.* hath already given to this Objection?

*R. P.* I tell you I read none of his Books and know not what he hath written, but as I find it in *T. G.*

*P. D.* What is that?

*R. P.* Have I not told you already, *That the Church of* England *doth not allow any Worſhip to be given to the Altar?*

*P. D.* And is not that to the Purpoſe? For dare any of you ſay ſo of the *Church* of *Rome* in reſpect of *Images?*

*R. P.* But *T. G.* ſaith, *This is not the meaning of the Canon which Dr.* St. *produces:* For, he ſaith, *The Canon only implies that they give no Religious Worſhip to it, but they do not deny any kind of Worſhip to be given to it; and Dr.* St. *himſelf grants, that there is a Reverence due to Sacred Places.* Dial. p. 180.

*P. D.* Now your Bolt is ſhot, I hope I may have leave to ſay ſomething both in behalf of the *Canon* and Dr. *St.* (1.) For the *Canon*, I ſay as Dr. *St.* did, That it denies any Worſhip to be given to the *Altar*; for it makes the Adoration to be immediately made to the *Divine Majeſty*, without Reſpect to the *Altar*, either as the *Object* or *Means* of *Worſhip*; which I prove, (1.) From the *Introduction.* For can any Words be more expreſs than thoſe in the *Introduction? For as much as the Church is the Houſe of God, dedicated to his Holy Worſhip* (not to that of the Altar) *and therefore ought to mind us both of the Greatneſs and Goodneſs of his Divine Majeſty* (not of the Sacredneſs of the Altar) *certain it is that the Acknowledgment thereof, not only inwardly in our Hearts, but alſo outwardly with our Bodies, muſt needs be pious in it ſelf, profitable unto us, and edifying unto others.* If the Intention of the *Canon* had been to have given any Worſhip to the *Altar*, the *Introduction* muſt have related to that, and not to the Divine Majeſty.

(2.) From the *Recommendation*; *We therefore think it meet and behoveful, and heartily commend it to all good and well-affected People, Members of this Church, that they be ready to tender unto the Lord,* (not to the Altar) *the ſaid due Acknowledgment by doing Reverence and Obeyſance both at their coming in and going out of the ſaid Churches,* &c. *according to the moſt Ancient Cuſtom of the Primitive Church in Pureſt Times, and of this Church alſo for many Years of the Reign of Queen* Elizabeth.

(3.) From the expreſs diſowning *the giving any religious Worſhip to the Communion Table.* Which is not meant of an *inviduum Vagum*, but of this *Act* of *Adoraion*, which is the *Religious Worſhip* here ſpoken of; and thereby no kind of *Worſhip* is intended to the *Altar*, but only to *God.* And which is more plain yet by what follows, *That it is not done out of an Opinion of the Corporal Preſence of Chriſt's Body on the Table, or in the Myſtical Elements; but only* (mark that) *for the Advancement of God's Majeſty, and to give him Alone,* (not the Altar together with him) *that Honour and Glory which is due unto him, and no otherwiſe.* Can any Words be plainer than theſe? They want only *Legiſlative Gothick*, and a *Finger* in the *Margin*, for *T. G.* to underſtand them.

(4.) Arch-

(4) Archbiſhop *Laud*, who certainly underſtood the meaning of this *Canon*, pleads only for the *Worſhip* to be given immediately to *God* himſelf. *God forbid*, ſaith he, *That we ſhould worſhip any thing but God himſelf*: And he adds, *If there were no Table ſtanding, he would worſhip God when he came into his Houſe.* And he calls it ſtill, *Doing Reverence to Almighty God, but only towards his Altar*: And he ſaith, *The People did underſtand this fully, and apply the Worſhip to God, and to none but God.* *Speech in Star-Chamber*, p. 43, 46.

(5.) When the introducing this, was made One of the *Articles* of his *Charge* by the *Commons*; his Anſwer was, *That his bowing was only to worſhip God, not the Altar; and I hope it is no Offence or Treaſon to worſhip God in the King's own Chappel, or to induce others to do the like.* Canterbury's *Trial*, p. 473.

(6.) I do not find any of our *Divines*, who pleaded moſt for it, do contend for any more than *worſhipping God towards the Altar*, and not giving any *Worſhip* to the *Altar*; the Arguments they uſed were for determining the *Local Circumſtance* of *Worſhip*, and not for making the *Altar* the *Object* of it. And the Difference between theſe Two Dr. *St.* hath at large cleared. Defence, p. 705, &c.

*R. P.* But cannot we ſay, That we only *worſhip God before an Image*, and do not give *any Religious Worſhip to the Image*; and then the Caſe is Parallel?

*P. D.* You may ſay ſo, and you ſometimes do, to deceive ignorant People; but you cannot ſay it truly. For, (1.) Your *Councils* have determined, That *Religious Worſhip is to be given to Images*; our *Canon* ſaith, *It is not to be given to the Altar*, therefore the Caſe is far from being Parallel. And Dr. *St.* hath fully proved, That the *Nicene Council* did require *Religious Worſhip to be given to Images*; *and Anathematizes all who did it not. And utterly rejects thoſe that ſay, They are to be had only for Memory, and out of ſome kind of Honour or Reverence; for nothing but Religious Worſhip would ſatisfy them.* And the *Acts* of that *Worſhip* are expreſſed to be not only *Bowing* but *Proſtration*, *Kiſſing*, *Oblation* of *Incenſe* and *Lights*: And Dr. *St.* hath elſewhere ſhewed, That all the *Acts* of *Worſhip* which the *Heathens* did perform to their *Images* in *Old Rome*, are given to *Images* in *Modern Rome*. (2.) Thoſe in the *Church* of *Rome*, who have only contended for the *Worſhip* of *God before the Image*, have been condemned by others as *ſavouring of Hereſy*, who ſay it is a Matter of *Faith* in the *Roman Church*, *that Images are to be worſhipped truly and properly*; and that the contrary Opinion is *dangerous*, *raſh*, *and ſavouring of Hereſy*, which is likewiſe proved at large by Dr. *St.* Defence, p. 577, &c. *From p.* 648. *to* p. 699. *From p.* 583. *top*, 599.

*R. P.* But doth not Dr. *St.* himſelf allow *a Reverence due to Sacred Places*?

*P. D.* He doth ſo. But do you obſerve the Difference he puts between *that* and *Worſhip*? I will endeavour to make his diſtinct Notion of theſe things plain to you.

Firſt, He diſtinguiſhes between *Honour* and *Worſhip*:
(1.) *Honour* he makes to be *the Eſteem of Excellency*;

Either { *Inward*, only in the Mind. / *Outward*, in Acts ſuitable to that Eſtimation.

And

And this *Excellency* may be Twofold, 1. *Perſonal.* 2. *Relative.*
1. *Perſonal*; and that Threefold:

1. *Civil*; in Regard of *Human Society*, as that of *Abraham* to the *Children* of *Heth.*
2. *Moral*; on Account of *Moral Excellencies*; either *Natural*, or *Acquired.*
3. *Spiritual*; in Regard of *Supernatural Graces*:

And that may be given Two ways,

(1.) To the *Perſons* as *preſent*; which is *Religious Reſpect*: as that of *Nebuchadnezzar* to *Daniel*, Dan. 2. 46. Of *Abraham* to the *Angels*, Gen. 18. 2.
(2.) To them as *Abſent*; and this is *Religious Honour*: And it lies chiefly in *Thankſgiving* to *God* for them, and celebrating their *Memories*; becauſe the *Honour* of *Divine Graces* ought to redound chiefly to the *Giver* of them.

2. *Relative*; from the *Relation* which things have to what we eſteem on the Account of its own *Excellency.*

1. *Civil Relation* to our *Friends*, or *Strangers* whom we eſteem; and ſo we ſet a Value on their Pictures, on their Letters or Hand-writing, or any thing belonging to them.
2. *Spiritual Relation* to *God* and his *Worſhip*; and the Regard to theſe he calls *Reverence.*

And that lies in theſe things:

(1.) *Diſcrimination* from common Uſe.
(2.) *Conſecration* to a ſacred Uſe.
(3.) *Suitable Uſage* of them in Regard of that *Relation.*

But if you ask wherein the Difference of this lies from *Worſhip*; He ſaith, from the greateſt *Divines* of your *Church*, that

(2.) *Worſhip* hath a Reſpect to *Power* and *Superiority*; and that is

1. *Civil*; in Regard of the *Power* and *Authority* of *Magiſtrates.*
2. *Religious*; in Regard of *God's peculiar Sovereignty* over us.

And that is Twofold,

1. *Internal* in *Submiſſion*, *Dependance.*
2. *External*; which muſt be,
   1. Such as expreſs our Submiſſion and Dependance; as
      1. *Sacrifice.* 2. *Solemn Invocation.* 3. *Adoration.* 4. *Vows.* 5. *Swearing by him*, &c.
   2. They muſt be *peculiar* to himſelf.

1. From

1. From the *Dictate* of *Nature*, as to the *Peculiarity* of *God's Sovereignty*.
2. From the *Will* of *God*, which *appropriates* such Acts to himself.
3. From the *Consent* of *Nations* and the *Christian Church*.

Therefore the giving that *Worship* which is *due* to *God*, and doth expreſs our *Subjection* to him, to any thing beſides him, is Violation of the *Rights* of *God's Sovereingty*; and if it be given to any Creature, it receives its Denomination from the *Nature* of that Creature to which it is given.

- (1.) To *Animate Creatures*.
  - *Angels*. { *Good*. / *Bad*.
  - *Dead* Men. { *Saints*. / *Wicked*.
  - *Brutes* of all Sorts.
- (2.) To *Inanimate*.
  - *Natural*. { *Elements*. / *Minerals*. / *Plants*.
  - *Artificial*; made to repreſent the *Objects* of *Worſhip*, and therefore called *Images*.

Which is properly *Idolatry*, being the *Worſhip* of a *Repreſentation*; but becauſe that Word *Idol* is extended to any *Creature* to which the *Worſhip* proper to *God* is given; therefore every ſuch kind of *Worſhip* is in *Scripture*, and by the *Chriſtian Church*, called *Idolatry*. And by this *Scheme* of Dr. *St's Notion* of theſe things, you may eaſily underſtand the Difference he puts between *Reverence* and *Worſhip*.

*R. P.* But *T. G.* ſaith, *The Church of* Rome *requires by the Terms of Communion with her, no more than Reverence, or Honorary Reſpect to Images.* Dial. p. 181.

*P. D.* Why doth *T. G.* go about thus to impoſe on his Readers without Anſwering what Dr. *St.* had produced to the contrary, from three Things?

1. From the *Decrees* of the *Second Council of* Nice.
2. From the conſtant Opinion of their moſt *Eminent Divines*, both before and after the *Council* of *Trent*.
3. From the Publick and allowed *Practices* of their *Church*.
   1. In *Conſecration* of *Images* for *Worſhip*; with *Forms* preſcribed in the *Roman Pontifical*.
   2. In *Supplication* before them, with *Proſtrations* and all other *Acts* of *Worſhip* which the *Heathens* uſed towards them.
   3. In *Solemn Proceſſions* with *Images*, with the ſame kind of *Pomp* and *Ceremony* which was uſed in *Heathen Rome*.

And after all this can *T. G.* have the Confidence to ſay, this is only *Honorary Reſpect*, without anſwering to any one of theſe Particulars, which were purpoſely alledged to prove the contrary?

*R. P.* But now, Sir, look to your ſelf, for the *Patronus bonæ Fidei* knocks all down before him, and proves *Bowing to the Altar, practiſed in the Church of* England, *to be worſe than* Popiſh *or* Egyptian *Idolatry.*

*P. D.* I hope not worſe than the *Power* of *Excommunication*, which the ſame Excellent *Advocate* for *Fanaticks* hath beſtowed as ill Names upon, and with as little Reaſon: But ſuch as it is, I am prepared to receive it.

Prodrom. p. 76. *R. P.* The *Patronus bonæ Fidei* ſaith, that, *However Dr.* St. *wheedled and blinded with Preferments* (for that is the meaning of *T. G.*'s, &c.) *endeavours to palliate this kind of Adoration, and to vindicate it from the Crime of Idolatry; yet I doubt not to affirm, that this Bowing outvies the Idolatry both of* Egyptians *and* Romaniſts, *not only in horrible Iniquity and Enormity, but in Madneſs and Folly.*

*F. C.* Who is this *Patronus bonæ Fidei*, you ſpeak ſo much of? He is a good Man, I warrant him. He ſpeaks home to the Buſineſs.

*P. D.* Yes, if Ignorance and Confidence doth it? For never did Man betray more than your *Advocate*, in this Saying.

*F. C.* He will prove it, I warrant you.

*P. D.* Juſt as you did *Kneeling* at the *Communion* to be *Idolatry*; if ſo well. But firſt for the *Roman Idolatry.*

Dial. p. 183. *R. P. It is not*, ſaith he, *ſo much Madneſs in them to adore the Lord Jeſus under the Species of Bread, as it is an Error in them to believe Tranſubſtantiation. But it is an Hypochondriacal Madneſs, and Giddy-brained Stupidity, for Men to perform Adoration towards that Place, where Chriſt is no more preſent than any where elſe; and where neither the Table, nor Altar, nor any thing that is ſet upon the Table (unleſs perchance a clean Towel, Two Books richly bound, or a Pair of Candleſticks with Two Candles in them, not to be lighted, till their Minds be quite drunk with Popery) repreſent either Chriſt or his Image. A Fanatical Adoration*, he calls it, *without any Object.*

*P. D.* Call you this proving? It is rather Raving and Foaming at the Mouth. This is ſuch Biting as may endanger an *Hydrophobia.* There is no arguing with ſuch a Man, but in a dark Room and under good Keepers. But that you may take no Advantage by his Sayings; how can it be *Idolatry without an Object*? i. e. *Idolatry* without an *Idol.* But can there be no *Object* of Worſhip but what is *Viſible*? What doth he worſhip himſelf? Or rather whom do his *Clients* the *Fanaticks* worſhip? Nothing? Becauſe not a *Viſible Object.* Is not *Adoration* a part of Worſhip? If not, it is no *Idolatry* to give it to an *Image.* If it be, then Bowing to an *Inviſible Object* in a Place dedicated to *Divine Worſhip*, is giving to *God* that Worſhip, which being given to an *Image* makes it *Idolatry.* I pray Sir, do you anſwer for him.

*F. C.* I underſtand you not.

*P. D.* I thought ſo. But I will endeavour to make you underſtand me. Is the *Bowing down* to an *Image Idolatry*?

*F. C.* Yes, without all doubt.

*P. D.* Is not *Idolatry giving* to a Creature *the Worſhip that is due to God*?

*F. C.* Yes.

*P. D.* How can that be *giving to a Creature the Worſhip due to God*, if it be not lawful to give this *Worſhip* to God which you give to the Creature?

*F. C.* I know not what you mean.

*P. D.* Not yet? Is not *Adoration* of an *Image*, *Idolatry*?

*F. C.* Yes, I told you ſo once already.

*P. D.*

*P. D.* Then *Adoration* is to be *given* to *God.* How elſe can the giving it to a Creature make it *Idolatry*?

*F. C.* I do not well underſtand you; but as far as I can gueſs, you ſpeak of *Bodily Worſhip*; but alas! We know, *That God muſt be worſhipped in Spirit and in Truth.*

*P. D.* Who denies that? But obſerve what follows, then no Man is guilty of *Idolatry*, that doth not *worſhip* an *Image in Spirit and in Truth*: But the Law forbids *Bowing down to them*, and *Worſhipping* of them; do you think, that *bowing down* is meant of the *Mind* or of the *Body*?

*F. C.* What is it you would have by all theſe Queſtions?

*P. D.* No more but this; that it is lawful to give *External Adoration* to the Divine Majeſty.

*F. C.* And what then?

*P. D.* Is it lawful to give *God* that *Worſhip*, (which it is lawful to give abſolutely) in a *Place* ſet apart for his *Worſhip*?

*F. C.* That is a ſtrange Queſtion indeed.

*P. D.* See now, what you have brought your ſelf to; to acknowledge that to be lawful which you ſo raſhly called *Idolatry.*

*F. C.* What is that?

*P. D. Bowing* in the *Church*, in Teſtimony of our *Adoration* of the *Divine Majeſty.*

*F. C.* That is not it; but it is *bowing to the Altar.*

*P. D.* Who knows beſt? Thoſe that made the *Canon*, or you? They declare they meant nothing elſe than what I have ſaid; and deny *any Religious Worſhip to be given to to the Altar.* And would not you think it hard for us to accuſe you for *worſhipping* your *Hats* in *Prayer*, becauſe you put them before your Faces when you pray; as you do us for *worſhipping* the *Altar*, becauſe we bow towards it?

*F. C.* But you look towards the *Altar* when you bow.

*P. D.* And are not your *Eyes* upon your *Hats* when you pray? And is not *Prayer* a *Part* of *God's immediate Worſhip*?

*F. C.* But we call it, *Bowing to the Altar.*

*P. D.* We may as well call yours, *Praying to the Hat.*

*F. C.* Some do aſſign the *Reaſon* of their *Worſhip* from the *Communion Table*, and we never do from our *Hats.*

*P. D.* They do not aſſign the *Reaſon* of their *Worſhip*; but the *Reaſon* of that *Circumſtance* of it, why that way rather than another; which they parallel with the *Jews* worſhipping of *God* towards the *Ark* and the *Cherubims*; which yet were no *Objects* of *Divine Worſhip*, either by God's Appointment, or the *Jewiſh Practice*, or in the Opinion of ſome of the moſt *Learned Divines*, even of the *Roman Church*; who make the moſt Advantage they can of it, as Dr. *St.* hath at large proved in his Anſwer to *T. G.*; and I do not hear of any *Reply T. G.* hath made to it. Defence from p. 702, to p. 717.

*R. P.* But the *Patronus bonæ Fidei* ſaith, *The Papiſts have more Reaſon to worſhip Chriſt on the Suppoſition of Tranſubſtantiation, than you have to worſhip* ———

*P. D.* What? Speak out. *The Altar*? We deny it to be any *Object* of *Worſhip* to us: If he means, than to worſhip God with *external Adoration towards the Altar*, let him do that, which he never yet did, prove what he ſaith; *viz.* That there is more Reaſon to worſhip Chriſt under the Bread on Suppoſition of *Tranſubſtantiation*, than for our giving *external Adoration* to the *Divine Majeſty.* For to give this *Adoration* to *God*, needs no other Suppoſition but of his *Infinite Majeſty* and *Omnipreſence*;

but to *worſhip* Chriſt on the *Altar* under the *Species* of *Bread*, doth not only ſuppoſe the Truth of one of the moſt abſurd Suppoſitions in the World, *That the Subſtance of the Bread is changed into the Body of Chriſt, and the Body of Chriſt is there inviſibly preſent under the Species of Bread*; but it ſuppoſes likewiſe theſe things. 1. That the *Body* of *Chriſt*, as united with the *Species* of *Bread*, is a *proper Object* of *Divine Adoration*: *i. e.* that theſe Two do make up One *entire Object* of *Divine Worſhip*: And then it follows, That the Sacramental Species are a partial Object of Divine Adoration; for whatever goes to make up an Object entire, muſt have Share with it; which is quite another thing from an *accidental Connexion*, as of a Prince's Robes together with his Perſon; for no Man ever ſaid the Princes Garments made up with his Perſon, an *Object* fit to be kneeled to in token of *Subjection*. But here is an Union ſuppoſed between *Chriſt's Body* and the *Accidents*; and ſuch an *Union* by vertue whereof *Divine Worſhip* is directed to the *Species* of *Bread*, and conſequentially to the *Body* of *Chriſt* as *united* thereto. 2. It ſuppoſeth, That the *Body* of *Chriſt* being thus united with the *Species* of Bread may receive all that *Worſhip* which is due to *God* alone. Which is not very eaſie to prove: Becauſe it doth not follow, that whereever a *Body* is, there thoſe things muſt be which do not reſult by neceſſary Concomitancy from the Being of a *Body*. For ſince it doth not follow by vertue of the *Hypoſtatical* Union, that whereever the *Divinity* is, the Human Nature of Chriſt muſt be there alſo; how doth it neceſſarily follow, that whereever the *Body* of *Chriſt* is, the *Divinity* is ſo preſent as to make that *Body* become an *Object* of *Divine Adoration*? We ſay the *Foot* is united to the *Soul* as well as the *Head*; but do we therefore ſay, That whatever is in the *Soul* is equally preſent in the *Foot* as in the *Head*? As that the Foot reaſons, conſiders, directs, as the Head doth. It is not therefore *bare Union*, but the *Manner* of *Preſence*, which doth make an *Object* fit for *Adoration*. That *Preſence* ought to be (if not glorious and becoming the *Divine Majeſty* in that reſpect) yet ſo well atteſted, as the *Divinity* of *Chriſt* was in his *Human Nature*, by the *Voice* of *Angels*, by *Teſtimony* of *God* himſelf from Heaven, by *Miracles*, by *Prophecies*, &c. But here is nothing like this; no Evidence being given of the *Divine Preſence* under the *Elements*, neither from *Senſe*, nor *Reaſon*, nor *Scripture*. For the *Scripture* is only pretended to ſpeak of the *Body* of *Chriſt*, and not of his *Divinity*.

*R. P.* But by vertue of the *Hypoſtatical Union*, whereever the *Body* of Chriſt is, his *Divine Nature* muſt be preſent too.

*P. D.* That, I know very well, is commonly ſaid by you; but, I pray, conſider theſe Two Things. (1.) If the *Body* of *Chriſt* may be preſent by *Reproduction* of the ſame *Body*; as ſome of your greateſt and lateſt Divines have aſſerted; then there is no ſuch Neceſſity of *Concomitancy* of the *Divinity* of *Chriſt*; becauſe they ſay, *God may reproduce the ſame Body without all the Accidents of it*, and conſequently without the *Hypoſtatical Union*. (2.) By the ſame way of *Concomitancy* they may hold the *Perſons* of the *Father* and *Holy Ghoſt* to be under the *Species*, and to be there worſhipped. For where the *Body* of *Chriſt* is, there the *Soul* is; where *Soul* and *Body* is, there the *Divinity* is; where the *Divinity* is, there the *Perſon* of the *Son* is; and where the *Perſon* of the *Son* is, there the *Perſons* of the *Father* and *Holy Ghoſt* are too.

*R. P.* You may account this an Abſurdity; but we account it none at all: Yea, ſome of our *Divines* have ſaid, *If the Holy Trinity were*

*not*

*not every where, yet it would be in the Euchariſt, by vertue of this Concomitancy.*

*P. D.* I do not now meddle with your Opinions; I only conſider the *Patronus bonæ Fidei* and his *Brethren*, who do look on theſe as Abſurdities; and yet are ſo fooliſh to ſay, that our worſhipping *God* towards the *Altar* is more abſurd than your *worſhipping Chriſt* on the *Altar*, on Suppoſition of *Tranſubſtantiation.* But, why worſe than *Egyptian Idolatry*, I beſeech you?

*R. P. The Egyptians*, ſaith he, *pretended ſome Colour for their Idolatry, as that an Ape, or a Cat, or a Wolf*, &c. *had ſome Participation of the Divinity; but thoſe that bow down to a Wooden Table are themſelves Stocks*: with much more to that Purpoſe. Dial. p. 184.

*P. D.* Is ſuch a Man to be endured in a *Chriſtian Common-wealth* (not to ſay a *Church*, for *Excommunication* he regards not) who parallels the *Adoration* given only to the *Divine Majeſty* (as our Church profeſſeth) with the *Worſhip of an Ape*, or a *Cat*, or a *Wolf*, &c? Nay, he makes *the Egyptian Idolatry* more reaſonable than our *Worſhip* of *God.* The only thing that can excuſe him, is Rage and Madneſs; and therefore I leave him to his Keeper. But I pray tell me, was it mere Kindneſs to the *Church* of *England*, which made *T.G.* to produce all theſe Paſſages at full length out of the *Patronus bonæ Fidei*? Or out of pure Spite to Dr. *St.* by ſo often repeating the Paſſage of his being *delinitus & occæcatus*? And why in ſuch a Place, where he pretends only to give an Account of Dr. *St.*'s *vain and endleſs Diſcourſes*, doth he bring in this at large? Is it only for his Comfort to let him ſee, there is One Body at leaſt in the World more fooliſh and impertinent than he? We have ſeen enough of what *T. G.* ought not to have done; let us now ſee what he ſaith Dr. *St. ought to have done.*

*R. P. The firſt thing to be done in a Diſpute, is to ſettle the State of the Controverſy upon its true Grounds, by laying down the true Notion of the Matter in Debate; therefore Dr.* St. *ought in the firſt Place to have given us the true Notion of Idolatry in the Nature of the Thing; and then to have ſhewn that Notion to have agreed to the Honour and Veneration which the Church of* Rome *in her Councils declares may be given to the Images of Chriſt and the Saints: But he choſe rather to dazzle the Eyes of the Reader with the falſe Lights of mere external Acts, the obſcure Practice even of wiſer Heathens, and the claſhing of School-Divines.* Dial. p. 193.

*P. D.* Now I hope we are come to ſomething worthy of Conſideration. I like the Method of proceeding very well. And I like Dr. *St.*'s Book the better, becauſe I think he purſued the right Method, beginning firſt with the *Nature* of *Idolatry* and *Divine Worſhip*; and then coming to the firſt Particular of *Image-Worſhip*, which he hath handled with great Care and Exactneſs in reſpect of your *Councils*, as well as your *Practices* and *School-Divines.*

*R. P. It is true, he propoſed well at firſt, but like a Preacher that hath patched up a Sermon out of his Note-book, he names his Text and then takes his leave of it. For, what he was to ſpeak to, was Idolatry in the Nature of the thing, independently of any poſitive Law; whereas he ſpeaks only of an Idolatry forbidden by a poſitive Law; but if there be no Idolatry antecedent to a poſitive Prohibition, the Heathens could not be juſtly charged with Idolatry.* Dial. p. 195, &c.

*P. D.* In my Mind, he did not recede from his *Text* at all, but purſued it cloſely; but you are uneaſie at his *Application*, and therefore find

find Fault with his *handling* his *Text*. What could a Man ſpeak to more pertinently as to *Idolatry* in the *Nature* of the *thing*, than to conſider, what that is, which is acknowledged to be *Idolatry* both in the *Heathens* and *Arians*; What that was, which the *Primitive Church* accounted *Idolatry* in them; What Opinions thoſe have of *God*, whom the *Roman Church* do charge with *Idolatry*; Wherein the *Nature* of *Divine Worſhip* conſiſts, not only with Reſpect to poſitive Commands, but the general Conſent of Mankind; Did * he not expreſly argue from the *Reaſon* and *Deſign* of *Solemn Religious Worſhip* abſtractly from poſitive Laws? Did he not ſhew † from many *Teſtimonies*, that the *Heathens* did look on ſome peculiar Rites of *Divine Worſhip*, as ſo *Sacred* and *Inviolable*, that they choſe rather to dye, than to give them to any but a *Divine Object*? It is true, after this, he enquires into the *Law* of *God*, and what *Acts* of *Worſhip* he had *appropriated* to himſelf; and was there not great *Reaſon* to do ſo? Are we unconcerned in the Laws *God* made for his *Worſhip*? In my Apprehenſion, this was the great thing *T. G.* had to do, to prove that *God's* Law about *Worſhip* was barely *Ceremonial*, and only reſpected the *Jews*; but that we are left to the *Liberties* of the *Law* of *Nature*, about *Religious Worſhip*: But he neither doth this, nor if he had done it, had he overthrown Dr. *St.*'s Book. For he proves in ſeveral Places, that the Heathens had the ſame Diſtinctions of *Sovereign* and *Inferior Worſhip*; *abſolute* and *relative*, which are uſed in the *Roman Church*; and if theſe do excuſe now, they would have excuſed them, who by Scripture and the Conſent of the Chriſtian Church are condemned for Idolatry. And judge you now, whether Dr. *St. took leave of his Text*, whether he did not ſpeak to *Idolatry* in the *Nature* of the *thing*.

* Defence, p. 191. p. 210.

† From p. 210. to p. 215.

*R. P.* But he ſaith, *The Heathens could not underſtand the Nature and Sinfulneſs of Idolatry, if not from ſome Law of God; which is in Effect to clear the Heathens from Idolatry, till that Law was delivered to them; whereas S.* Paul *ſaith, They had a Law written in their Hearts, whereby they might underſtand it; and Dr.* St. *ought to have ſhewn wherein the Deordination and Sinfulneſs of Idolatry did conſiſt antecedently to any poſitive Prohibition; and till this be done, he can make no Parallel between the Heathen Idolatry, and that of the* Roman *Church.*

P. 199, &c.

*P. D.* I am glad to find any thing that looks like a Difficulty, which may give an Occaſion of farther Thoughts about this weighty Matter, and of clearing the Doctor's Mind concerning it. Herein I ſhall endeavour to explain theſe Two Things. 1. How far Dr. *St.* doth make the *Nature* and *Sinfulneſs* of *Idolatry* to depend on the *Law* of *God*. 2. Wherein the *Sinfulneſs* of *Idolatry* doth conſiſt abſtractly from a poſitive Law.

1. How far he makes the *Sinfulneſs* of it to depend on a *poſitive Law*.

1. He ſuppoſes *Natural Religion* to dictate theſe things. 1. That *God* ought to be ſolemnly worſhipped. 2. That this *Worſhip* ought to be peculiar to the *Divine Nature* in regard of his *Sovereignty* over us, and the infinite Diſtance between him and his *Creatures*. 3. That the giving this ſolemn Worſhip which is due to *God*, to any *Creature*, is the invading the *Rights* of his *Sovereignty*. Thence he ſhews from *Aquinas*, that Worſhip is not given to God becauſe he needs it, but that the Belief of One God may hereby be confirmed in us by external and ſenſible Acts, which cannot be done unleſs there be ſome peculiar Acts of his Worſhip. And external Worſhip is a Profeſſion of internal; Acts being expreſſive of our Minds, as well as Words. Thence he determines, that *Idolatry* is a

Defence p. 194, 195, 196, 197.

Sin

Sin of the higheſt Nature, becauſe it invades *God's Peculiar Rights*; and implies Blaſphemy in it, becauſe it takes away from God the Peculiarity of his Dominion. Are not theſe Arguments drawn from the *Nature* of *the thing*, and not merely from a *poſitive* Law?

2. Notwithſtanding theſe Dictates of *Natural Reaſon* concerning the *Worſhip* of *God*; yet he ſuppoſes Mankind to have been ſo corrupted, as to have loſt the Senſe of the *Sinfulneſs* of giving *Divine Worſhip* to *Creatures*. Which, he ſaith, they did chiefly on a Threefold Suppoſition. (1.) That *God* committed the *Government* of the World under him to ſome *Inferior Deities*. Or, (2.) That *God* was the *Soul of the World*, and therefore the *Worſhip* given to the Parts of it did redound to him. Or, (3.) That *External Adoration* was below him, and that the Service due to *God* was that of our Minds, and the other might be given to Creatures. Pag. 113.

3. That *God* ſaw it neceſſary to revive the *Peculiarity* of his *Worſhip* by his *Law* given in the *Decalogue*; which although given to the *Jews*, was of *an Eternal* and *Immutable Nature*, being not built on any Reaſon peculiar to them, but common to all Mankind; and on this Account the *Chriſtian Church* did look on the ſame *Law* as obliging all Chriſtians; as the Doctor hath proved in ſeveral Places before-cited.

4. That when the *Apoſtles* went Abroad to reclaim the World from *Idolatry*, they made uſe of no other *Notion* of it, than what was received among the *Jews*; and by the *Reaſons* on which the *Law* of *God* was founded, they convinced the World of that Sin of *Idolatry*, which by the Corruption of Mankind, and the Cuſtom of the World, they had loſt the *Senſe* of. And this was plainly the meaning of Dr. *St.*'s Words to any unprejudic'd Mind, as appears by laying theſe things together; which are all contained in the ſame Diſcourſe. If we ſay the *Gentiles* had loſt the Senſe of other Sins, as it is evident they had, and the Apoſtles made uſe of the *Law* of *God* to convince them; doth it hence follow, that the *Sinfulneſs* of thoſe things did barely depend upon a poſitive Law? And therefore the *Notion* of *Idolatry* may be ſaid to be *New*, not as tho' it were not againſt the *Principles* of *Natural Religion*, but becauſe they had loſt the *Senſe* of them: So the *Law* of *Moſes* was a *New Law*, tho' it revived the *Law* of *Nature* in its Moral Precepts; the *Doctrine* of Chriſt was a *New Doctrine* to the World, altho' moſt agreeable to the Principles of Natural Reaſon.

(2.) The *Sinfulneſs* of *Idolatry* according to *Natural Religion* conſiſts in theſe things. (1.) In taking away the due Senſe of the *Diſtance* between *God* and his Creatures: Which is a Violation of the *Rights* of his *Sovereignty*, and conſequently it is *Crimen læſæ Majeſtatis Divinæ*, or *Treaſon* againſt the *Divine Majeſty*. (2.) In neglecting to give *God* the Worſhip which was proper to him. And this was the conſequent of *Idolatry*; and not as tho' the *Nature* of *Idolatry* did lie barely *in not giving to God the Worſhip due to him*, as *T. G.* ſeems to ſuggeſt: But when Men did accuſtom themſelves to the *Worſhip* of *Idols*, they grew ſo fond of their own Inventions, that they had five *Ave Maries* for one *Pater Noſter*; and ſo the *Worſhip* of *God* came to be almoſt loſt in the Croud of *Deities* which they joined with him. (3.) In worſhipping *bad Spirits*, inſtead of good ones; which craftily inſinuated themſelves among the *Idolaters* under the Pretence of *Inferior Deities*. For ſo the People ſtill believed them to be *good Spirits*, and their learned Men defied all thoſe who ſaid they worſhipped any other, as Dr. *St.* hath ſhewed; yet the *Chriſtians* proved Dial. p. 205. Defence, p. 518.

they

they were evil, because they received that *Worship* from them, which the good ones would not do. (4.) In disparaging the *Divine Nature* by making *Images* to represent him, (which suggested mean Thoughts of God to their Minds, lessening the Apprehensions of the *Greatness* of his *Majesty*) and hoping to please *God* by worshipping such Representations of him. Which he thought so dishonourable to himself, that he forbids it by a severe Law, and punished the Transgressors of it; and from hence the Christian Church hath accounted the same thing *unlawful* to them, because so *dishonourable* to *God*. (5.) In taking away that *Dependance* upon *God*, which he expects from his *Creatures*. For when they suppose that *God* hath committed the *Care* of these things to any Inferior Beings, they are apt to make their Addresses to them more frequently because of a *Vicinity* of *Nature* to them; and to depend upon them for *Help* in time of need; which takes off that entire Trust in *God* which is most agreeable to his *Wisdom*, *Goodness* and *Providence*. (6.) In giving *Divine Worship* to *vile* and *wicked Men* instead of *God*. This was an *Aggravation* of *Idolatry*, and increased the *Sinfulness* of it; altho' the *Nature* of *Idolatry* doth not lie in giving *Divine Worship* to *bad Men*, but to any *Creatures*. And in this Particular lay the abominable Sinfulness of the *Poetical Idolatry* among the *Greeks* and *Romans*, which was in this Respect worse than of the most barbarous Nations we ever read of. (7.) The more vile the Practices, the more mean the Submissions, the more gross the Errors of *Idolaters* were, the greater was the *Sinfulness* of *Idolatry*. Hence the *filthy and obscene Actions* of the *Eastern*, *Greek* and *Roman Idolatries*; the *mean Submissions* and the *gross Errors* of the *Egyptian Idolatries* heightned the *Sinfulness* of them. These are the main things wherein the *Sinfulness* of *Idolatry* did consist, abstractly from any *positive Law*: You see how freely I give them to you upon such an Invitation, and much good may they do you. If Dr. *St.* had thought *T. G.* had desired any such thing from him, I do believe he would have added not only a *Seventh*, but an *Eighth Chapter* for his sake on such a Subject as this, which it is so easy to enlarge upon. But I stop for fear *T. G.* should think I am only Patching up a *Sermon* out of *Note-Books*; yet I think I have not taken leave of my *Text*.

Dial. p. 201.

*R. P.* Did you ever hear of the *speaking Trumpet*?

*P. D.* What hath the *speaking Trumpet* to do with *Idolatry*? I am afraid I waked you out of some pleasant Dream, you talk so far off from the Business. Now I think of it, I have found it by the *Train* of *Thoughts*, in Mr. *Hobbs* his way. *Text* led you to *Preaching*, and *Preaching* to the *speaking Trumpet*, because of the rare Invention of the *Virtuoso*, to have one *Parson* to preach to a *whole County*.

*R. P.* No, that is not it. *T. G.* brings it on the occasion of this Dispute.

*P. D.* Doth he truly? But how comes it in? As the Man brought in *Hercules* into his *Sermon* by *Head* and *Shoulders*?

*R. P.* *T. G.* is a Man of a great Reach; and therefore he may be allowed to bring in a thing, which another Man would never have thought of.

*P. D.* But I pray how?

*R. P.* You know the *Virtuoso* argued thus, *If the speaking Trumpet might be made to carry the Voice a League, then Eight Mile about; if Eight Mile, then round a whole County; and then why not from one Nation to another, there being no Stop in Art*?

*P. D.* This

*P. D.* This is very ridiculous ; but how doth *T. G.* apply it ?

*R. P.* To Dr. *St.*'s Argument againſt *Relative Worſhip* ; *who ſaith that by virtue of that, Men may worſhip the Sun, the Stars, the Earth , or any other Creature.* Dial. p. 202.

*P. D.* And doth not the Argument hold ?

*R. P.* No ; *T. G.* ſaith, *it is like the* Virtuoſo's *arguing about the Speaking-Trumpet.*

*P. D.* I pray tell how. In my mind *T. G.* rather imitates the *Virtuoſo's Swimming on the Table* ; for he puffs and blows, and moves all the Joints of his Body, but he is on the *Table* ſtill. The Difficulty remains juſt where it was ; and the *Speaking-Trumpet* takes away none of the Force of it. For the Parity of *Reaſon* holds in one Caſe, which it is ridiculous to imagine in the other.

*R. P. T. G.* ſaith, *there is a Conformity between it, and the Extenſion of Worſhip to any Creature. For,* he ſaith, *there is a ſtop in Nature.*

*P. D.* How and where ? For why may not I worſhip *God* in any *Creature* as well as by an *Image* ? Where are the Meaſures and Bounds fixed, that thus far we may go and no farther ? Why may we not worſhip Trees, and Fountains, Earth, and Water, and the whole Hoſt of Heaven as well as an Image ? If we have due Apprehenſions of *God* in our Minds as the *Creator* of them, and do not ſuffer our Worſhip to reſt *abſolutely* on the *Creatures*, but intend to carry it at laſt to *God*, and *to fall only after an Inferior manner upon them.* I cannot for my heart find out *this ſtop in Nature.* For the *Reaſon* of *Relative Worſhip* as to an *Image*, is bare *Imagination*, ſuppoſing that Perſon to be preſent who deſerves Worſhip : But in the *Worſhip* of the *Creatures*, there is a *Real Preſence* of the *Divinity*, and a certain *Relation* which the *Creatures* have to *God* ; why therefore may I not worſhip *God* in any of his *Creatures*, as well as by an *Image* ? And ſo the Ancient *Idolatry* of the *World*, which the *Chriſtian Religion* rooted out, may by the Help of this Trick of *Relative Worſhip* be revived again.

*R. P.* You run too faſt. For *T. G.* ſaith, *the Creatures, ever ſince Senſe prevailed againſt Reaſon, are become like Stumbling-blocks to the Souls of Men, and a Snare to the Feet of the Unwiſe, to allure and draw them to the worſhip of them.* Dial. p. 204.

*P. D.* And do you think *Images* ( but that they are ſet ſo high ) have not more of the *Nature* of *Stumbling-blocks* in them : Are they ſuch Immaterial and Inſenſible Things, when S. *Auguſtine* ſaith, *Their very Faſhion and Shape is apt to move Men more, and the Likeneſs to a Living Being prevails more on the Affections of miſerable Men to worſhip them, than their Knowledge that they are not Living doth to the Contempt of them* ; as Dr. *St.* obſerved. Defence, p. 529.

*R. P.* But *T. G.* adds, *That thoſe very Divines of the Church of* Rome *who do admit the Conſequence in Speculation, and do not condemn the Practice of it in Philoſophical and Contemplative Men, who conſider the Creatures purely as the Works of God, and as it were behold him preſent in them ; do notwithſtanding utterly condemn the common and promiſcuous Uſe of it in the Vulgar, as expoſing them to manifeſt danger of being ſeduced by the tempting Beauty and aſtoniſhing Power of the Creatures, to forget the Creator, and worſhip them.*

*P. D.* What is become of the *Speaking Trumpet* now ? And of the *Stop in Nature* ? All the Danger, it ſeems, is in the *Dulneſs* and *Stupidity* of the *People.* And yet, if I miſtake not, *T. G.* hath provided againſt this,

Dial p. 419. when he ſaith, *The Difference is ſo great between Vulgar Heathens and Chriſtians, as to the Believing in one God the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth, and of all Things Viſible and Inviſible.* If the common People have ſo firm and ſettled a *Notion* of this in their Minds, they may as eaſily paſs from the *Scale* of *Creatures* to the *Creator*, as from an *Image* to what is repreſented by it. Is there ſo much Danger they ſhould ſtop in the Creatures, and none at all they ſhould *ſtop in Images*; when himſelf confeſſeth, *It is Idolatry to worſhip the Images themſelves?* And ſince Dr. *St.* hath ſhewn from their own *Divines*, how many ways *Idolatry* may Defence, p. 698. be committed in the *Worſhip* of *Images*. (1.) If *proper Latria*, or *Divine Worſhip* be given to an *Image*, it becomes an *Idol.* Nay *Bellarmine* ſaith, *That thoſe who worſhipped an Image of Chriſt with Divine Honours, altho' it were for the ſake of Chriſt, and not of the Image, did commit Idolatry. Therefore*, he ſaith, *thoſe were condemned for Hereticks, who gave Divine Worſhip to the Image of Chriſt.* If then the People happen to give *Divine Worſhip* to an *Image*, altho' they do not believe it to be ſo, yet this doth not excuſe them from *Idolatry*: *For*, ſaith he, *altho' a Man pretend in Words, the Worſhip to be Relative, or for the ſake of God, or Chriſt; yet it being Divine Worſhip, he doth really do it abſolutely, and for themſelves.* (2.) When *Images* are worſhipped as *true Repreſentations of the Divine Nature.* (3.) When *Images* are worſhipped for the ſake of any *Sanctity, Virtue*, or *Divinity abiding in them.* But tell me now, whether common People are not in Danger of any of theſe Things, as much at leaſt as of *Reſting in the Creatures*? Is it not as eaſy for them to forget the Diſtinction of *Abſolute* and *Relative Worſhip*, or to fancy *God* to be like the *Images* of him; or to imagine ſome *Sanctity, Virtue*, or *Divinity* to be inherent in the *Images*; as to *ſtop at the Creatures*, and to go no higher? Yea, more than this; have not the common People been charged with Defence, p. 309. doing theſe Things by your own *Divines*? When they tell us of their *Madneſs in the Worſhip of Images*; *and that there was little or no difference between their Worſhip and that of the Heathens*? In ſome Places cited by Dr. *St.* Is it poſſible for any Man that obſerves what the common People do, to imagine that they place no *Sanctity, Virtue*, or *Divinity* in their *Images*? When they walk ſo many Miles Bare-foot to a certain *Image* of our *Lady*; when they *creep* upon their *Bare Knees* towards it; when they make *Formal Supplications* to the *Images*, with as much Ceremony as if the Perſons they repreſent were *preſent*; when they look with ſo much *Submiſſion* and *Devotion* towards them; when they come with ſuch mighty Expectations of *Relief* and *Help* from them; when they tell Stories of ſo many *Miracles* which have been wrought by them; nay, when their learned Men, who ſhould have more Wit or Honeſty, write *Books* on purpoſe to heighten theſe *Follies* and *Madneſſes* of the *People.* Can you, with any Face ſay, *There is not ſo much danger in the Worſhip of Images, as in the Worſhip of the Creatures*? I did not expect, after what Dr. *St.* had repreſented in this Matter, *T. G.* ſhould have given ſo wretched an Anſwer as this. For if this were all to keep Men from the *Relative Worſhip* of *Creatures*; I dare affirm, that moſt of the *Fathers* Arguments againſt this ſort of *Idolatry* were very weak and feeble, and that they did not reach the *Philoſophical* and *Contemplative* Men; but only the dull and ſtupid *Vulgar*; that there was nothing of *Real Idolatry* in their *Worſhip* of the *Creatures*, but only Danger to the *common People*, and Scandal to the *Weak.* Name me that *Chriſtian*, who through all the *Primitive Church* ever let fall an Expreſſion to this Purpoſe. It was *Idolatry, down-*

*right*

*right Idolatry* they charged them with in the *Worſhip* of *Creatures*, and not any meer *ſcandalous Compliance* with the *ignorant Vulgar*. If this had been all they meant, for all that I can ſee the *Work* of the *Apoſtles* and the *Primitive Chriſtians* had been to have informed them only of the *True God* whom they were to worſhip in the Creatures; and if all the People were once throughly informed of this, all the Ancient *Rites* of *Worſhip* might have continued. They might have ſtill *baked Cakes* to the *Queen* of *Heaven*, and worſhipped the *whole Hoſt* of *Heaven*; they might have continued their Devotion to the *Earth*, and *Fire*, and *Trees* and *Fountains*, if they did but direct their Worſhip through them to *God*. What mean all thoſe Sayings of *Fathers*, all thoſe *Canons* of *Councils*, wherein this very manner of *Worſhip* was condemned for *Idolatry*? as Dr. *St.* hath in part ſhewed. Speak out, Gentlemen, and let us know what you think of the *Primitive Church*, which ſo freely condemned this *Relative Worſhip*; but never imagine we will be guided by your Modern *Schools*, or the *Doctrine* of your *Church* in theſe things, againſt the Conſent of the whole *Primitive Chriſtian Church*; whoſe *Fathers* you muſt condemn as Children, and whoſe *Martyrs* you muſt look on as *Fools*, if your Doctrine of *Relative Worſhip* be allowed. For moſt of thoſe who ſuffered *Martyrdom* might have eſcaped, if they had allowed theſe Principles of *Relative Worſhip*; no more being required of them, but to do as the reſt did, *to burn a little Incenſe* in Obedience to the Laws, to make ſome cuſtomary *Libations* before the *Emperors Images*, to make the *common Supplications* at the *Temples* of *Veſta* or *Ceres*, or any other of the *Gods*, which the *Philoſophers* underſtood of the ſeveral Parts of the World; and might they not have done all theſe things, and referred the *Worſhip ultimately* to the *True God*? I do not think this ſo trifling a Matter as *T. G.* makes it, but I think the Honour of *Chriſtianity* and of the *Primitive Martyrs* deeply concerned in it; and I wiſh you not to maintain your *Fooleries* upon ſuch Principles as reflect Diſhonour upon *Chriſtianity* it ſelf.

Defence, p. 400. &c.

*R. P.* Methinks the *Speaking Trumpet hath rouzed you*, and put you into a Fit of furious Zeal.

*P. D.* No Sir, I do aſſure you. It is the *Honour* I have for *Chriſtianity* which hath made me ſpeak thus warmly; for I am very unwilling to have the *Primitive Chriſtians* to ſuffer as *Fools*, and as *weak Brethren*.

*R. P.* But *T. G.* ſaith from *Voſſius*, *That the Gentiles concluded Nature it ſelf to be God, and the Parts of it alſo to be Deities, and that they forſook God and ſtaid in the Worſhip of Nature.*

Dial. p. 204.

*P. D.* Some Perſons not Inferior to *Voſſius* for Learning or Judgment in theſe Matters, do ſuppoſe it to be a great Miſtake in him to make the *Gentiles* worſhip *Inanimate Nature for a True God*, which ſay they, is in plain Terms to make them *Atheiſts*: For then they muſt own nothing but meer Matter in the World. And to what purpoſe Men ſhould worſhip an Inanimate Senſeleſs Being, it is very hard to underſtand; it is therefore much more probable that they did own ſome *Inferior Deities* over the ſeveral Parts of the World, and *one Supreme* which paſſed through all; whom they did worſhip in and by his *Creatures*. But I am not now to give an Account of the *Pagan Idolatry*, of which we ſhall have occaſion to diſcourſe afterwards. That which I inſiſt upon is, that thoſe who had a right Notion of *God* might upon the Principles of *Relative Worſhip*, have juſtified themſelves in doing the ſame things which the

*Heathens* did, provided their Intentions were directed aright; and consequently that there was no Neceſſity of taking away the *Heathen Rites* as *Idolatrous* in reference to the Parts of the World, but only of acquainting them more fully with the *Notion* of *God*, and the Nature of *Relative Worſhip*.

Dial. p. 206. *R. P.* But *T. G.* ſtill ſtands to it, *That there is more Danger in worſhipping the Creatures, than in the Worſhip of Images; becauſe the Creatures are not ſo apparently repreſentative of God, as an Image is of the Perſon repreſented by it, which carries the Thoughts preſently and effectually to him. But the other needs a great deal of Diſcourſe to diſcover the Analogy they bear to the Creator, and the Dependance they have of him for their very Being: yet ſo, that from the Greatneſs and Beauty of the Creatures the Maker of them may proportionably be ſeen.*

Defence p. 806. *P. D.* To this Dr. *St.* gave a full Anſwer, when he ſaid, that in an Object of Worſhip, we are not ſo much to conſider the *Quickneſs* of *Repreſentation*, as the *Perfections* repreſented. Although therefore an *Image* may carry ones Mind ſooner to the thing repreſented, than the *Creatures*; yet the one is ſo infinite a Diſparagement to the *Divine Nature* in Compariſon of the other, that there is far greater Danger upon *T. G.*'s Principles in one than in the other. I will make this plain to you by this inſtance. Suppoſe the Image of a venerable Old Man with Pontifical Habits ſet up to repreſent *God Almighty*, as hath been uſual in the *Church* of *Rome*; and one Man worſhips *God* by this; another, he looks upon the *Sun* as a wonderful *Work of God*, and he worſhips *God*, as manifeſting himſelf in the *Sun*: The Queſtion now is, Whether there be more *Danger* in worſhipping *God* by an *Image*, or by the *Sun*? I ſay by an *Image*. For (1.) *T. G.* confeſſes, *That Images are unlawful Objects of Worſhip, which are conceived to be proper Likeneſſes of the Divinity*: Now I appeal to your ſelf, whether Men are not more apt to take the *Image* of a Man for a Likeneſs of the *Divinity*, than any of *God's Creatures*? Beſides (2.) *Images* do not repreſent any thing that *deſerves* our *Worſhip*; but only Lineaments and Figures, the Work of Painters and Carvers; but the *Creatures* repreſent to our Minds infinite Power, Wiſdom and Goodneſs, which are the greateſt *Motives* of *Divine Worſhip*. For as Dr. *St.* hath ſaid, the leaſt Work of Nature infinitely exceeds the greateſt of Art in Curioſity, Beauty, Strength, Proportion and every thing that can diſcover Wiſdom and Power. (3.) The *Preſence* of *God* in an *Image* is only by a *Fiction* of the *Mind*, a Man fancying the true *Object* of *Worſhip* to be really preſent; but in the *Creatures* there is a *real Divine Preſence*: And where there is greater Reaſon for Worſhip, there is ſurely the leſs Danger. (4.) If the greater Excellency of the *Creature* make the Danger greater, then, as Dr. *St.* argued, where there is leſs *Excellency*, there is leſs *Danger*; and conſequently there muſt be leſs Danger in *worſhipping* the *Inanimate Creatures* than *Animate*, and *Brutes* than *Men*, and mere *Moral* Men than *Saints*; becauſe the *Danger* muſt increaſe as the *Excellency* doth; And conſequently the *Egyptians* were more excuſable in their *Worſhip*, than you. And by this Reaſon there was leſs Danger in worſhipping the *Tail* of the *Aſs* our Saviour rode upon, than St. *Peter*, or his pretended *Succeſſor*. (5.) There is leſs *Danger* of *Worſhip* where the *Repreſentation* is more *divine* and *ſpiritual*, than where it is more groſs and corporeal; but the Repreſentation of *God* is much more divine and ſpiritual by his *Creatures* than by *Images*. And therefore, *Cardinal* Lugo *ſaid*, *If a Wooden Image*

Defence p. 805.

*may*

*may be worshipped for the sake of the Exemplar, much more such a lively Image of God as Man is.* And thus upon this Principle of *Relative Worship*, all the several sorts of *Idolatry*, which were used among the *Heathens*, may be revived, and set up with as fair Pretences at least as Image-worship.

*R. P. T. G.* saith, *If Dr. St. can discern God so easily in his Creatures, as a Man's Mind is carried from the Image to the Prototype, he believes he is one of the most admirable Persons in the Meletetiques in the whole World.* Dial. p. 207.

*P. D.* What is this but trifling in weighty Matters? I would allow *T. G.* as much Scope for his Wit, as he would desire; provided it become the Gravity of the Subject. What is there in these *Meletetiques*, but what is the Duty of every good Man, *to see God in his Works?* Which all Persons do who are not *Atheists:* And is this a Thing to be exposed to Scorn and Derision?

*R. P.* But *T. G.* takes it *for that Part of Mystical Theology which ineffences the Soul with God.*

*P. D.* Alas for his Ignorance! that he cannot distinguish between *Natural* and *Mystical Theology.* I always took the *seeing* the great Evidences of *God's Power, Wisdom* and *Goodness* in his *Creatures*, to be *Natural Theology*: And is it not possible to discover *God* in his Works *without ineffencing the Soul with God*? This is too mean and low for *T. G.*; surely you father this upon him. For I can hardly believe this, and many other Passages you mention, to be written by him; or else *T. G.* hath helped me to another piece of *Meletetiques*; for I discover him much better in his *Works* than I did before; but with no great Advantage either as to his *Wisdom* or *Goodness.*

*R P.* You may satisfy your self, if you please, that I do not wrong him; for here's the Book; and in the next Page he compares Dr. *St.* *with one who said, Christ might be better represented by a Cow than a Crucifix; and another who said, he detested the Image of Christ Crucified.* Dial. p. 208.

*P. D.* For what good End was Dr. *St.* joined with these? (supposing the Stories true, which I hardly believe) hath he ever said any such thing? or that tended that way? It is the *Worship* he writes against, and not the *bare Representation* of *Christ Crucified.* *T. G.* was not to seek for Dr. *St.*'s Mind in this Matter, for these are his Words. I do not say there is as great Incongruity in representing the Human Nature of Christ, as there was in representing the Infinite Nature of God; but I say there is as great Incongruity still in supposing an Image, of whatsoever it be, can be the proper Object of Divine Worship. For the Humanity of Christ is only capable of receiving Adoration from us, as it is hypostatically united to the Divine Nature; and if the Human Nature of Christ be not, what then is the Image of it? What Union is there between the Divine Nature and a Crucifix? All that can be said is, that Imagination supplies the Union, and Christ is supposed to be present by Representation. But (1.) this overthrows all Measures and Bounds of Worship, and makes it lawful to worship any Creature with respect to God. (2.) It contradicts the Argument of S. *Paul*, for then *God may be worshipped with the Work of Men's Hands.* (3.) 'Tis contrary to the Sense and Practice of the *Primitive Church*, which interpreted the Second Commandment to hold against all *Images* set up for *Worship*, as well those proper to *Christians*, as other among *Jews* or *Gentiles.* Why did not *T. G.* rather answer these Arguments, than make odious Comparisons of him, with *Viret* and *Beza*? But there is a Reason for all things, if a Man can hit on it. Defence P. 746.

*R. P.*

*R. P.* But *T. G.* wonders *Dr. St. ſhould diſcover God ſo eaſily in his Creatures, while he ſaith elſewhere, the Creatures can give no greater than Moral Certainty of the Being of God himſelf.*

*P. D.* It was well thought upon, and deſerves an Anſwer; becauſe *T. G.* is not the only Perſon who hath cavilled at this. If Dr. *St.* by *Moral Certainty* doth mean only a *bare Probability*, there were ſome Colour for the Objection; but in the very Place to which *T. G.* refers, he aſſerts the *higheſt Degree of Actual Certainty*: And that which he calls *Moral Certainty*, he ſaith is a firm, rational, and undoubted Certainty. Why then may not Dr. *St.* diſcover *God* in his *Creatures*, ſince he aſſerts ſo great an Aſſurance of *God's* being their *Creator?*

Rat. Acc. p. 178, 179

*R. P.* But why then doth he call it *Moral Certainty*?

*P. D.* It is mere cavilling, when a Man's Mind is underſtood, to be quarrelling at his Terms; eſpecially if they be ſuch, as others have uſed before him, and ſeem moſt agreeable to the *Nature* of the *Evidence*. For we may conceive theſe ſeveral ſorts of *Certainty*.

1. A *Certainty* of *Principles*: Which is that, I ſuppoſe, they call *Metaphyſical Certainty*. For that was the proper Office of *Metaphyſicks*, to eſtabliſh certain *General Principles*, which might be of *Uſe* to all other *Sciences*: Such as thoſe, *that both Parts of a Contradiction cannot be true of the ſame thing*: and that, *of every thing, either the one, or the other part of a Contradiction is true.* Theſe are ſuch *Principles*, * of which *Ariſtotle* ſaith, *It is folly in any Man to go about to demonſtrate them, any otherwiſe than by ſhewing the abſurdity of him that denieth them. They are ſuch*, Themiſtius ſaith, *which every Man hath by Nature, and without which he cannot be ſuppoſed to learn any thing*; and theſe are called *ſelf-evident* and *indemonſtrable Principles*, and *Actions* which need no more than the bare repreſentation of them to the Mind; as *that the whole is greater than a part*; *If you take away equal things from equal, the remainder is equal*: For whatever depends upon Induction, or needs any Medium to prove it, more than the bare Perception of Terms, was never by any Philoſopher accounted an *indemonſtrable and ſelf-evident Principle.* Much leſs were *Identical Propoſitions* taken for *Firſt Principles*, by any Man that ever underſtood what *Principles* were; as it were very eaſie to prove, if there were occaſion for it. I have but two things to add concerning this kind of *Certainty*.

Ariſt. Anal. Poſt. l. 1. c. 11. n. 5, 6, 7. Metaph. l. 1. c. 12. l. 13. c. 1. Philop. in Analyt. l. 1. p. 27. *Metaph. l. 4. c. 6. Themiſt. in Analyt. Poſt. l. 1.

1. That the *Certainty* of our own *Beings*, is equal to this *Certainty* of *Principles*; it being a thing of Natural and Immediate Evidence: For the very *doubting*, as well as *thinking*, proves the Certainty of the Being of that which doubts. And where there is ſuch evident Perception as of Firſt Principles, and our own Beings, the Aſſent is as neceſſary, as for the Balance to incline where the greateſt Weight lies.

2. That *Self-evident Principles* have very little influence upon our Knowledge of other Things: And therefore a late Philoſopher obſerves, that even *that Fundamental Principle, that it is impoſſible the ſame thing ſhould be, and not be at the ſame time, is of little or no Uſe for finding out of Truth.* And ſuppoſing the Firſt Principle of the Certainty of our own Beings to be granted the *Carteſians* (which no Man, who Thinks, can deny them) yet I do not ſee how the truth of other Things conveyed by our Senſes, can be drawn from thence; the one being an *abſolute Certainty*, the other only depending on a Suppoſition, which carries not equal Evidence along with it; which is the next kind.

Du Homel de mente hum. l. 2. c. 7. n. 4.

2. A *Certainty* by *Senſe*, or upon Suppoſition, that we are ſo framed, as not to be deceived in the moſt plain and clear Perceptions of Senſe. This is that, I ſuppoſe, they mean by *Phyſical Certainty*. It implies no Contradiction we ſhould be ſo deceived, and conſequently it is ſhort of the firſt kind of *Certainty*. But withal the Suppoſition is ſo juſt and reaſonable, that ſuch a Man's Underſtanding may be juſtly queſtioned, who queſtions the plain Evidence of Senſe as to Light, and Day, and Bodies, *&c.* and all Mankind, in ſpight of their moſt ſubtle Arguments, do truſt their *Senſes*. And *Epictetus* well ſaid, *That if he, and two or three more, were Servants to a Sceptick, they would make him hang or ſtarve himſelf, if he did not change his Opinion.* And *Galen* ſaith, *The Evidence of Senſe needs no Demonſtration; for all thoſe things which are evident to Senſe, are to be believed for themſelves.* Arrian. l. 2. c. 20. Galen. de Hippocr. & Plat. decret. l. 2.

3. A *Certainty* by *Reaſon*, or of deducing ſomething not known, from that which is known. Which is ſo evident in *Mathematical Demonſtrations*, that no Man who underſtands the Terms, and attends to the Proof, can forbear his aſſent. *Ariſtotle* did attempt to bring the way of Reaſoning in other things to *Mathematical Certainty*; which was the great Deſign of his *Logick*. To this end he begins with the Explication of *Simple Terms*, and ſo he proceeds to *Propoſitions*, and then to the joyning of two of theſe ſo together, that from thence a *third thing* may follow, by vertue of ſome *middle Term* wherein they agree. But becauſe the *Concluſion* may not neceſſarily follow, where the manner of Reaſoning was true, therefore in order to *Demonſtration*, he ſuppoſes *Two ſorts of Principles*. 1. *Axioms*, or *Common Principles*, received by all that underſtand them. 2. *Poſitions*; which are Twofold: 1. *Suppoſitions*, or *Poſtulata*. 2. *Definitions*. But after all, he grants that only ſuch things are capable of *Demonſtration*, which have a certain and immutable Cauſe. And he puts a difference between a *Neceſſary Concluſion*, and a *Demonſtration*: The one depending on the *Form* of *Syllogiſm*, the other upon the *Neceſſity* of the *Cauſe*. But in *Demonſtrative Syllogiſms*, *Ariſtotle* doth not require ſome degree of Neceſſity but the higheſt, when the Connexion between the Subject and Predicate is ſo great, that one cannot be defined without the other; ſo that *Logical Demonſtration* muſt be of an inſeparable Property, and by the moſt immediate and neceſſary Cauſe. But very few things in the World are capable of ſuch *Demonſtrations*, by reaſon of our Ignorance of the Eſſential Properties, and immediate Cauſes of things; and thoſe Inſtances which are brought either by *Ariſtotle* or his *Commentators*, are about ſuch things where *Demonſtration* was leaſt needful, and tend very little to the Improvement of our Knowledge.

4. A *Certainty* which ſuppoſes ſome *Moral Principles*, and proceeds upon them. Such as theſe, *That every Intelligent Being Acts for ſome End*; *That it is not the Intereſt of Mankind to deceive one another*; *That there are ſome things fit to be choſen, and others to be avoided*; *That Circumſtances vary the Nature of Actions*; *That where Compariſons are made, the greateſt good and the leaſt evil are to be choſen.* Such as theſe, I call *Moral Principles*; which have *Self-Evidence* in them to any Man that underſtands the Terms. And whatever doth neceſſarily follow from theſe Principles, may be juſtly called a *Moral Demonſtration*.

5. A *Certainty* which ſuppoſes an *immediate Divine Aſſiſtance*, to preſerve the Mind from Error, and this is *Infallible Certainty*. For the Mind

Mind of Man being of it ſelf liable to miſtake in its Apprehenſion and Judgment of Things, nothing can preſerve it from a Poſſibility of Error, but immediate Aſſiſtance from *God*, who cannot be deceived, and will not deceive.

Theſe things being premiſed, we are now to enquire what kind of *Certainty* that is, which we have concerning the *Principles* of *Religion*.

1. For the Principles of *Natural Religion*. You are to conſider what kind of Adverſary Dr. *St.* had to deal with, *viz.* One who pleaded for an *Infallible Certainty*, as that Infallibility doth imply *Divine Aſſiſtance*, as neceſſary in order to an Obligation to Aſſent. Againſt this Dr. *St.* objects, That the main Foundations of all Religion, which are the Being of God, and Immortality of the Soul, were not capable of this kind of Proof: Becauſe this very Notion of *Infallibility* doth ſuppoſe that which he would prove, *viz.* That there is a God who muſt give this Aſſiſtance. But at the ſame time he yields, that we have as great Evidence and Certainty, as Human Nature is capable of, of ſuch a Being as *God* is, from the Conſideration of his Works; which being neither from Mathematical Demonſtrations, nor Supernatural Infallibility, he called *Moral Certainty*. Which he might do from theſe Grounds.

Rat Acc. p. 178, 206.

1. Becauſe the force of the Argument from the Creatures depends upon ſome *Moral Principles*. *Viz.* From the Suitableneſs and Fitneſs of things to the Wiſdom of an intelligent and infinite Agent, who might from thence be inferred to be the Maker of them. It being unconceivable that mere Matter ſhould ever produce things in ſo much Beauty, Order and Uſefulneſs as we ſee in every Creature; in an Ant or a Fly as much as in the vaſt Bodies of the Heavens.

2. Becauſe they do ſuppoſe ſome *Moral Diſpoſitions* in the Perſons, who do moſt readily and firmly aſſent to theſe Truths. For although Men make uſe of the higheſt Titles for their Arguments, and call them *Infallible Proofs*, *Mathematical Demonſtrations*, or what they pleaſe; yet we ſtill ſee Men of bad Minds will find ſomething to cavil at, whereby to ſuſpend their Aſſent; which they do not in mere *Metaphyſical Notions*, or in *Mathematical Demonſtrations*. But virtuous and unprejudiced Minds do more impartially judge, and therefore more readily give their Aſſent, having no Byaſs to incline them another way. Although therefore the Principles be of another Nature, and the Arguments be drawn from *Idea's*, or *Series* of *Cauſes*, or whatever *medium* it be, yet ſince the Perverſeneſs of Men's Will may hinder the force of the Argument, as to themſelves, the *Certainty* might be called *Moral Certainty*.

2. As to the *Chriſtian Faith*. So he grants,

1. That there are ſome Principles relating to it, which have *Metaphyſical Certainty* in them; as, that *Whatever God reveals is impoſſible to be falſe*, or as it is commonly expreſſed, though improperly, is *infallibly True*.

2. That there is a *Rational Certainty*, that a *Doctrine* confirmed by ſuch Miracles, as were wrought by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, muſt come from God: That being the moſt certain *Criterion* of Divine Revelation.

3. That there was a *Phyſical Certainty* of the Truth of *Chriſt's Miracles* and Reſurrection from the dead, in the *Apoſtles* who were *Eye-witneſſes* of them.

4. That there was an *Infallible Certainty* in the *Apoſtles* delivering this Doctrine to the World, and writing it for the Benefit of the Church in all Ages.

5. That

5. That we have a *Moral Certainty* of the *Matters of Fact*, which do concern the *Doctrine*, the *Miracles*, and the *Books of Scripture*: Which is of the same kind with the Certainty those had of Christ's Doctrine and Miracles, who lived in *Mesopotamia* at that time; which must depend upon the Credibility of the *Witnesses* who convey these things, which is a *Moral Consideration*; and therefore the *Certainty* which is taken from it may be properly called *Moral Certainty*. Of which there being many Degrees, the highest is here understood, which any Matter of Fact is capable of.

And now I pray tell me, what Reason hath there been for all this Noise about *Moral Certainty*?

*R. P. T. G.* owns, *That the Dr. in other Places doth acknowledge a true Certainty of the Principles of Religion; but*, saith he, *he can say and unsay without Retracting, with as much Art and Ease as any Man he ever read.* Dial. p. 209.

*P. D.* I had thought *Unsaying* had been *Retracting*. But Dr. *St.* saith as much in those very Places *T. G.* objects against, as in those he allows. Only *T. G.* delights in Cavilling above most Authors I have ever read.

*R. P.* But doth not Dr. *St.* allow a *Possibility of Falshood*, notwithstanding all this Pretence of *Certainty*? P. 210.

*P. D.* Whatever is true, is impossible to be false; and the same Degree of Evidence any one hath of the Truth of a Thing, he hath of the Impossibility of the Falshood of it: Therefore he that hath an undoubted Certainty of the Truth of *Christianity*, hath the same Certainty that it is impossible it should be false. And because Possibility and Impossibility are capable of the same Distinctions, that *Certainty* is; therefore according to the Nature and Degrees of *Certainty*, is the Possibility or Impossibility of Falshood. That which is *Metaphysically certain* is so impossible to be false, that it implies a *Contradiction* to be otherwise: But it is not so in *Physical Certainty*, nor in all *Rational Certainty*, nor in *Moral*: And yet, whereever any Man is certain of the Truth of a thing, he is proportionably certain, that it is impossible to be false.

*R. P.* This only relates to the *Person*, and not to the *Evidence*: Is there any such Evidence of the *Existence* of a *Deity*, as can *infallibly* convince it to be absolutely true, and so impossible to be false?

*P. D.* I do not doubt, but that there are such Evidences of the *Being* of *God*, as do prove it to any unprejudic'd Mind *impossible to be otherwise*. And *T. G.* had no Reason to doubt of this, from any thing Dr. *St.* had said, who had endeavoured so early to prove the *Being* of *God*, and the *Principles of Christian Faith*; before he set himself to consider the Controversies which have happened in the *Christian Church*. *T. G.* therefore might well have spared these Reflections, in a Debate of so different a Nature; but that he was glad of an Opportunity to go off from the Business, as Men are, that know they are not like to bring it to a good Issue. Origines Sacræ, l. 2. & 3.

*R. P. T. G.* confesseth this is a *Digression*; but he promises to return to the Matter; and so he does I assure you, for he comes to the *Second Thing, which*, he saith, *the Dr. ought to have done*, viz. *to have shewed how the Notion of Idolatry doth agree to the Doctrine of the Church of* Rome *in her Councils.* Dial. p. 213.

*P. D.* It is a wonder to me, you ſhould think him defective in this, when he ſhews that there are Two things from whence the Senſe of the *Roman* Church is to be taken: 1. From the *Definitions* of *Councils*. 2. From the *Practice* of the *Church*.

* Defence, from p. 575. to 605.

1. From the *Definitions* of *Councils*. And here * he entred upon the Conſideration of what that *Worſhip* was, which was required to be *given* to Images: And ſhewed from the Words of the *Council*, and from the Teſtimony of the moſt eminent Divines of the *Roman* Church, that it was not enough to *worſhip before Images*, and to have an *Intention* to perform thoſe *External Acts*; but there muſt be an *Inward Intention* to *worſhip* the *Images themſelves*; and that the contrary Doctrine was eſteemed little better than downright Hereſy.

2. From the *Practice* of the *Church*. For he ſhews many of your beſt *Divines* went upon this Principle, that *God would not ſuffer his Church to err*; and therefore they thought the allowed *Practice* of the *Church* ſufficient for them to defend thoſe things to be lawful which they ſaw generally practiſed. And from hence he makes it appear, that the *Church* of *Rome* hath gone beyond the *Council* of *Nice* in Two things.

*Defence, from p. 556. to p. 575.

1. In making and worſhipping *Images* of *God* and the *Bleſſed Trinity*, which was * eſteemed *Madneſs* and *Pagan Idolatry* in the time of the *Second Council* of *Nice*; and is juſtified by the Modern *Divines* of the *Church* of *Rome* from the general *Practice* of their *Church*.

†Defence, from p. 606, to p. 639.

2. In giving the *Worſhip* of *Latria* to *Images*; † which was condemned by the *Council* of *Nice*; and notwithſtanding is defended by Multitudes of *Divines* in the *Roman Church*, from the allowed *Practice* in the *Worſhip* of the *Croſs*; both before and after the *Council* of *Trent*.

* Defence, from p. 639. to p. 699.

After which he enquires at large into the Publick *Offices*, and commended *Devotions* of that *Church* in reſpect to *Images*, and from thence he * proves, that 1. As to *Conſecration* of *Images* for *Worſhip*. 2. As to the *Rites* of *Supplication* to them. 3. As to pompous *Proceſſion* with them, the Modern *Church* of *Rome* doth not fall ſhort of the Practice of *Pagan Rome*.

And do you think all this is not applying the *Notion* of *Idolatry* home to the *Roman Church*? When, 1. He ſhews by the Principles of the Second Council of *Nice*, the Modern Practices of the *Church* of *Rome* are chargeable with *Idolatry*. 2. That the *Practices* agreeable with that *Council* were charged with *Idolatry* by the *Weſtern Church* in the *Council* of *Frankford*, not from any Miſtake of their Meaning, but becauſe they looked on the Worſhip then decreed to be proper Adoration.

Dial. p. 214.

*R. P.* But *T. G.* ſaith, *If the Worſhip defined by the Council of* Nice *were Inferior Worſhip, and not* Latria, *as Dr.* St. *confeſſeth, then nothing can be clearer than that it was not the Worſhip due to God; and conſequently the Church of* Rome *cannot be chargeable with Idolatry from any thing contained in that Decree.*

*P. D.* Will *T. G.* never underſtand the Difference between the *Intention* of the *Perſon* and the *Nature* of the *Act*? They might declare it to be only *Inferior Worſhip*, but the *Council* of *Franckford* took it to be proper *Adoration* which was due only to God. And if that Council's Judgment muſt ſtand, all thoſe in the *Church* of *Rome* who give *Latria* to the *Croſs*, muſt be guilty of *Idolatry*.

Dial. p. 215, &c.

R. P. *Doth not the Church of* England *allow Bowing to the Altar, which if the Altar had any Senſe would think were done to it*; as *T. G.* ſaith, *he was certainly informed of a Country-Fellow, who being got near the Altar in his*

*his Majesty'e Chapel, thought all the Congies had been made to him, and so returned Congy for Congy. And if Bowing may be used out of Religious Respect to the Altar, why not Kneeling, or Prostration, or Fixing our Eyes in time of Prayer, or Burning Incense or Lights before the Images of Christ and his Saints: But how can Dr.* St. *purge the Church of* England *from Idolatry in that Practice, when he saith, that any Image being made so far the Object of Divine Worship, that Men do bow down before it; (and he supposes the same will hold for any other Creature) it doth thereby become an Idol, and on that Account is forbidden in the Second Commandment?*

*P. D.* What would *T. G.* have done, had it not been for this Practice of Bowing towards the *Altar?* When yet he cannot but know that the Practice of it is not enjoyned by our *Church*, for the *Canon* leaves it at Liberty: If the *Church* of *Rome* did the same about the *Worship* of *Images*, the Parallel would hold somewhat better. But the *Church* of *Rome* declares *Religious Worship* is to be given to *Images*, and our Church declares that *none is to be given to the Altar*; and doth not this make an apparent Difference? If the Country-Fellow standing without the Rails fancied the Congies made to himself; what would he have done, if he had stood within an *Image* of our *Lady*, and seen all the Courtship that had been used towards her by some of her devoted Servants and Slaves; when he beheld the bare Knees bleeding, the Tears trickling, the Breast knocking, the Eyes scarce lifted up, to shew the greater Reverence and Humility towards the Image, what could he have thought, but that he was shut up within the Bowels of the *Goddess* they worshipped? Whereas if the Country-Fellow had gone up into the Court, and seen the Ancient Servants make their Reverences after Dinner in the *Presence-Chamber*, he would soon have been better informed; if some of the old Courtiers had told him it was the Ancient Custom of the Court to make their Reverences in all *Chambers* of *Presence*; and from thence when they went into his *Majesty's Chapel*, they used the same Custom out of Reverence to *God* Almighty, whose *Presence-Chamber* they accounted the *Chapel* to be. What is all this to giving *Religious Worship* to the *Altar*? Wherein the Force of all *T. G.* saith must lie.

*R. P.* But you *do bow before the Altar; as we do before Images.*

*P. D.* I utterly deny that. For your *Church* declares *Bowing* before *Images*, without an Intention to *worship* the *Images*, *is next to Heresy*, (if we are to take the Sense of your Councils from their own Words, and the Explication of Divines;) You explode their Doctrine, who say, *that we are only to worship God before them.* And is there no Difference between the *Acts* of these Two Men as to Images themselves? The one declares that he looks on no *Religious Worship* as due to an Image, but it serves him only to put him in mind of him who is the proper Object of Worship; and he never intends by any *Act* of his to worship the Image it self: Another saith, the Church requires *Images to be worshipped*, and for my part I think my self bound to do what the *Church* requires; and therefore it is my Intention to give Worship not barely to the Object represented, but to the very *Image* it self, although it be on the Account of its Representation. And the latter Dr. *St.* hath shewed to be the only allowed Sense in the *Church* of *Rome*; and the other rejected either as *Heretical*, or *next to it.* Which *T. G.* never so much as once takes notice of. But however this doth not reach our Case; for we believe the Second Commandment to be still in force, which is express and positive against all *Worship* of *Images*, and *Bowing down to them*, but that which

was lawful among the *Jews*; notwithstanding, that Precept, *viz.* to worship *God* towards the *Mercy Seat*, is still lawful among *Christians*, *viz.* to worship *God* alone, but *towards the Altar*. And thus I hope *T. G.* will at last be brought a little better to understand the Sense of our Church in this Practice, and how far it is from being a Parallel with your *Worship* of *Images*.

Dial from p. 218. to p. 227.

*R. P.* T. G. *finds great fault with Dr.* St.*'s Citation out of Card.* Lugo, *about Submission to Images, because he left out* aliquis, *and* potest dici; and I tell you, he makes a huge Outcry about it, and fills up several Pages with it.

*P. D.* Doth he truly? It was a great Sign he wanted Matter to fill up his Book. But I pray on what occasion was this Passage brought in? It may be that will give us some Light into this Matter.

Defence, p. 599.

*R. P. T. G.* refers to the Page, but he never mentions the *Occasion*. It is such a Page.

*P. D.* Let us see what Dr. *St.* was proving in that Place. It was, that by the *Council* of *Nice* as it is explain'd by the *Divines* of the *Roman Church*, True and Real Worship is to be given to *Images*; and for this he produces the several Testimonies of *Suarez*, *Medina*, *Victoria*, *Catharinus*, *Naclantus*, *Bellarmine*, *Soto*, *Velosillus*, *Pujol*, *Tannerus*, *Tsambertus*, *Bassæus*, *Sylvius*, *Arriaga*, and at last Card. *Lugo*. If the thing be not proved which he designed, why is Card. *Lugo* alone produced? If it be proved, why is Card. *Lugo* produced at all?

P. 575.

*R. P.* Because he left out *aliquis* and *dici potest*.

*P. D.* But suppose the other be sufficient to express his Concurrence with the rest, what Unfairness is there in that, to shorten his Words, when he lays no Weight upon the *Manner*, but upon the *Thing*? Had Dr. *St.* charged *Lugo* with holding greater *Submission* than the rest, and then left out the *qualifying Expressions*, he had done him Injury. But he knew *Lugo* meant no more than the rest, and produced him for no other Purpose. If there be but any *Inward Affection* carried to the Image, which may be called a *certain kind of Submission to the Image*, it is all one to Dr. *St.*'s Purpose; which was only to prove, as he saith, in the same Page, from the *Acts* of the *Council*, and the *Judgment* of their learned and eminent Divines, *That by the Decree of the* Nicene *Council, such True and Real Worship is to be given to Images as is terminated upon the Images themselves*. Did these Testimonies prove this, or did they not? If they did not, why did not *T. G.* discover them all: if they did, why doth he so vainly cavil about something impertinent to the main Business, in the very last of all? So that, after all this Cry, there is very little Wool, unless it be that which is made of Goat's Hair.

R. P. *But this tends to breed an Impression in the Reader, that the Inward Affection Card.* Lugo *required, was of giving Submission to an Image as Superior; because in another Place he quotes the same Author for making* Cultus *to signify Reverence towards Superiors.*

*P. D.* But doth not the *Cardinal* say so?

*R. P. T. G.* saith nothing to the contrary, which I am sure he would have done, if he had not.

*P. D.* Well then; *Lugo* makes *worship* to be a *Reverence towards Superiors*; but he saith, *that true Worship is due to Images*. And is not this making the *Image Superior*?

*R. P.* I thought where I should have you; but *T. G.* hath explain'd *Lugo*'s meaning from himself.

*P. D.*

*P. D.* Let me hear it as *T. G.*, that candid and ingenuous Dealer, hath it.

*R. P.* He ſaith, *When we worſhip an Image, the inward Affection is not carried to the Image, after the ſame manner it is to the Prototype; for we worſhip the Prototype abſolutely*, i. e. *for its own proper Excellency; but the Image only with a relative Worſhip*, i. e. *for the Excellency not of the Image it ſelf, but of the Prototype; which kind of Worſhip he affirms to be far inferior to the other, which is abſolute.*

2. *We have not the ſame inward Submiſſion towards the Image, which we have towards the Prototype; for we ſubmit our ſelves to the Prototype, acknowledging it to be more excellent than our ſelves, and ſuperior to us; which kind of Submiſſion we cannot prudently conceive to belong to an Image; nor indeed any at all, by which we ſubmit our ſelves to it, preferring it before us.*

3. *The ſole external Act of kiſſing or bowing, is not ſo carried to the Image, but that ſome inward Affection alſo goes along with it, which he ſaith, may be called alſo ſome kind of Affection of Submiſſion; by which he means an Affection of ſubmitting our ſelves to the Image; for as much as the Act of the Will from which it proceeds, is an Affection of performing thoſe Acts about their Images, which we are wont to exerciſe towards our Superiors.*

*P. D.* Now, I hope, we have the *Cardinal's* true Meaning. From whence I deſire you to obſerve.

1. That the Difference he puts between the *Worſhip* of the *Image* and the *Prototype*, lies in the *inward Eſtimation* of the *Excellency* of the one above the other; which is as much as to ſay, that he doth really think there is more Excellency in *Chriſt himſelf*, than in a *Crucifix*. Which deſerves a ſpecial Remark; eſpecially being made by a *Cardinal*. When one might venture to ſay, that there is ſcarce an *Idolater* ſo ſottiſh in the World, but will acknowledge his *Deity* to be much better than the *Image* of him; and that he worſhips one for his own Excellency, and the other only out of Reſpect to him.

2. He acknowledges, that all thoſe *Acts* whereby we expreſs Reverence towards *Superiors*, may be uſed towards *Images*, as *Bowing*, *Kneeling*, *Proſtration*, &c.

3. That there is *ſome kind of inward Affection*, which may be called a *certain kind of Affection of Submiſſion, going along with theſe external Acts*. And doth not all this amount to *true and real Worſhip*? Which was the thing Dr. *St.* deſigned to prove. For here, without exception, all thoſe *Acts* whereby our *Reverence* towards *Superiors* is expreſſed, may be uſed to *Images*; *i. e.* all tokens of *Submiſſion* to them, and an *inward Affection of ſome kind*, which may be called *Affection of Submiſſion*. By which we find it yielded to us, that all external *Acts* of *Adoration* may be given to *Images*, provided, that the *inward Affection* be carried after a different *Manner* to the *Prototype*, and to the *Image*; which no *Idolater* in the World, if *Maimonides* may be believed, would ever deny: If they believed any other *Gods* beſides their *Idols*, as he ſaith, *there were none but did.* So that Card. *Lugo*, upon fair Ground, gives up all *Peculiarity* of any *External Acts* of *Divine Worſhip*; and for all that I can ſee, may ſacrifice to an *Image*, or offer up the Hoſt to it, on the ſame Reaſons that they make their *Proſtrations* before it. And he underſtood the Conſequence of his own Doctrine ſo well, that he doth not ſeem to boggle at it on the Account of Adoration. But as long as *T. G.* yields, that Cardinal *Lugo* doth allow all *external Acts* of *Submiſſion to Images*, and ſuch an *inward Affection* as to make that *Submiſſion ſincere and real*, Dr. *St.* hath all which his Heart could deſire from this Teſtimony of *Lugo*.

*R P.*

*R. P. But all this amounts to no more*, *T. G.* saith from him, *but that the Prototype deserves to be treated honourably, not only in it self, but in all things which have Connexion with it, as an Image or the like.*

*P. D.* That is, *God* may be worshipped in any *Creature*; and any Act of *Adoration* may be performed towards it, if it have a respect to him; whether by a real or imaginary Presence. Which takes away the Distinction of Divine Worship; as it is applied to outward Acts, and all necessary Discrimination between the *Worship* we give to *God*, and to his *Creatures*: And if this be for the Honour of his *Sovereignty* and *Dominion* over us, let the World judge.

Dial. p. 228. *R. P. After all this*, *T. G.* saith, *That Dr.* St. *agrees with Cardinal* Lugo *in the thing, although he quarrels with him about the Words.*

*P. D.* That is News indeed. How doth *T. G.* make that out?

Defence p. 600, 601. *R. P. Because he saith from* Aquinas, *That although no irrational or inanimate Being be capable of that real Excellency to deserve any Honour from us for its own sake; yet on the Account of a Relation to Divine Things they may deserve a different Regard and Usage from other things.*

*P. D.* This is true; but he immediately distinguishes, from St. *Augustin*, between the *Peculiarity* of *Use* belonging to the *Sacred Utensils*, and the *Worship* given to *Images*.

*R. P.* That is no Matter how he distinguishes, as long as the Consequence holds from one to the other. Dial. p. 229, 230, 231. *For if a religious Respect be due to Sacred Places and Things on the Account of their Relation to God, and an inward Intention of the Mind to express it towards them by an outward Token of Submission, as bowing to the Altar, it comes to the same thing which Cardinal* Lugo *pleads for to an Image, so that if one be Idolatry, the other must be so too.* So that *T. G.* concludes very triumphantly, *That by these Edge-tools*, viz. *School-distinctions*, *Dr.* St. *hath cut the Throat of his own Cause.* And then he brings in the *Patronus bonæ Fidei* again.

*P. D.* Methinks another writing of the same worthy Author had been much more proper, called *Jugulum Causæ*. But is it possible for *T. G.* not to apprehend the Difference of these things? I will once more endeavour to make it plain to you. The *Reverence* to *Sacred Places* and *Things*, differs from the *Relative Worship* of *Images* in these things.

1. In the *Acts* belonging to them. For this I need only to repeat Dr. Defence, p. 603. *St.*'s Words. "Is there no Difference between a Religious Respect (if "I may so call it) to sacred Places and Things, and all the most solemn "Acts of Adoration, which were ever given to Images by the most sot- "tish Idolaters? Such as Kneelings before them, Prostrations, Praying "with their Eyes fixed upon them, as though they were speaking to "them, Burning Incense and Lights before them, which are as great "Testimonies of Worship as ever were used by the greatest and most "sottish *Idolaters*. And here Cardinal *Lugo* allows all *External Acts* of *Submission* to *Images*; whereas in the other Case, *Discrimination* is all that is contended for, out of *Reverence* to them. As for *Bowing towards the Altar*, it hath been so often answered before, that I shall not repeat.

2. In the *Reason* of *Worship*. For if the *Reason* assigned for the *Worship* of *Images* be *peculiar* to them, then it cannot hold for all Sacred Things and Places. Now the *Reason* of the *Worship* of *Images* is *Representation* of the *Prototype*, as *present* to the Fancy of him that worships; but this cannot hold for the *Sacred Utensils* and *Places*, which have their *Honour* for the sake of the *Use* they are dedicated to. Thus if *Images* in *Churches* were appointed only for *Use*, without any *Worship* to be given

veri to them, it would come much nearer to a Parallel, than they can do now, when they are conſecrated and ſet up on Purpoſe for *Adoration*; as they are continually in the *Roman Church*.

3. In the *Diſtinction* the *Law* of *God* makes between them. For when it moſt ſeverely prohibits the *Worſhip* of *Images*, it not only allows, but commands the *reverencing God's Sanctuary*; and the *conſecrating Sacred Veſſels* for the *Uſe* of the *Temple*. So that where the Law diſtinguiſheth, we haveReaſon to do it too: And ſo the *Chriſtian Church* did, when it looked on the *Worſhip* of *Images* as *unlawful*; yet they did ſhew *Reſpect* and *Honour* to *Sacred Things* and *Places*: And *Honour is all they are capable of*, as St. *Auguſtine* ſaith, *but no Worſhip doth belong to them*. So that theſe *Edge-Tools* do no Execution at all, but upon *T. G.*'s *Images*; which could never have been framed without them, and yet are deſtroyed by them.

*R. P.* You think to eſcape *about the Doctor's unfaithful reporting the Senſe of Authors*, with this One *Teſtimony* of Cardinal *Lugo*; but you are deceived, I have another ready for you of *Gregory Nyſſen*.

*P. D.* Another! I expected *Hundreds* upon *T. G.*'s *Outcries*. When he ſaith, *the Citations are many and long, and out of Authors of all Nations, and all Ages, and all Religions*. What! but another? Dial. p. 226.

*R. P.* You would have *T. G.* write an Anſwer as big as *Fox's Acts and Monuments*; but you are deceived, he is wiſer than ſo. *For he hath a particular Averſion to a great Book upon one Subject. If he can diſcover Four or Five Citations faulty, that will take away the Reputation of all the reſt.*

*P. D* A very ſhort way, I confeſs. Methinks One or Two may ſerve; and ſave Candle and Firing, and Waſte-Paper. Nay one ſingle Teſtimony may do it, with an end of an old Latin Verſe tacked to it, *Crimine ab uno*——eſpecially ſuch a one as this of Cardinal *Lugo*. But, however let us hear that of *Gregory Nyſſen*.

R. P. *It is about the* Arians *being charged with Idolatry: Which is brought in with a great deal of Pomp among other Teſtimonies, to ſhew that the* Arians *were charged with Idolatry for the Worſhip they gave to Chriſt, whom they acknowledged to be a Creature, from thence to Parallel their Worſhip with that of the Church of* Rome *to the Saints*. Dial. p. 234.

*P. D.* I am glad to hear but one of thoſe Teſtimonies challenged; for if that be given up, there are enough remaining to prove his Deſign: Which you mightily miſtake, if you think it was only to *parallel* your Worſhip of *Saints* with the *Arians Idolatry*. For this is never ſo much as mentioned by Dr. *St.*; but he names ſeveral conſiderable Advantages which are gained by it in this Subject of *Idolatry*.

1. That there may be *Idolatry* where the true *God* is owned, and worſhipped, as he was no doubt among the *Arians*; from whence it follows, that the Nature of *Idolatry* doth not conſiſt in giving *Sovereign Worſhip* to a *Creature*, without reſpect to the *Creator*. Which will be of Uſe to us in the Debate about the *Pagan Idolatry*.

2. That *Relative Latria* being given to a *Creature* is *Idolatry*; for notwithſtanding they looked on Chriſt as the expreſs *Image of God*, yet becauſe they gave Divine Worſhip to him, ſuppoſing him to be a *Creature*, they were charged with *Idolatry*.

3. That making *God* the *Fountain* and *Original* of thoſe *Excellencies*, for which any *Creature* is worſhipped, doth not excuſe from *Idolatry*. For the *Arians* were guilty who ſuppoſed all the Excellencies of *Chriſt* to be derived from *God*.

4. That

4. That no Diſtinction of *Doulia* and *Latria*, doth excuſe from *Idolatry*; For the *Fathers* make the giving *Doulia* to Chriſt to be *Idolatry*.

5. That the *Notion* of an *Idol* is ſo far from being a *meer imaginary Figment* or *Chimera*, that it was attributed by the *Fathers* to the moſt excellent *Being*, even to *Chriſt* himſelf, when *Divine Worſhip* was given to him as a *Creature*.

Theſe are Matters of great Moment, if they hold good. Doth he paſs all theſe by, only to fall upon one ſingle Teſtimony? If he doth, it is a ſhrewd ſign, though he cried out of *Gregory Nyſſen*, yet he was pinched ſomewhere elſe. Well; but what is this horrible Crime about *Gregory Nyſſen*? Hath he brought him under an *Index Expurgatorius*? Hath he falſified his Words, and corrupted the Text? Or hath he wilfully altered his Senſe and Meaning? Hath he done it in all the Quotations out of him, or only in one? Whatever it is, let us have it.

*R. P.* It is in the *Citation* out of his Oration *de laudibus Baſilii*.

*P. D.* But the Dr. hath three or four more out of the ſame *Author*. It ſeems they ſtand well enough. Hath not the Dr. truly cited his Words?

*R. P.* Yes, *T. G.* ſaith, *as to the General, truly enough.*

*P. D.* What is the Fault then?

*R. P. That he doth not add the words that follow, wherein he ſhews what kind of Worſhip that was which the* Arians *gave to Chriſt*; viz. *Not only to worſhip and ſerve him, but alſo to fix hopes of Salvation in a Creature, and to expect Judgment from it. And was it not neatly done of the Doctor, to wrap up all this in thoſe ſhort words, The Devil perſuaded Men to return to the Worſhip of the Creature? Which is a Laconiſm not obſerved by him on other Occaſions: But it was here done on purpoſe to conceal from the Reader the apparent difference between the Worſhip of Saints in the Church of* Rome, *and the* Arians *Worſhip of Chriſt.*

Dial. p. 234, &c.

*P. D.* I am glad it is out at laſt, after ſo much ſtraining. See how much *Choler* there is in it! Indeed, it might have done him much harm, if he had kept it in any longer. But I wonder the *Laconick Gentleman* doth complain of *ſhortneſs*: Do you think the *Laconian* in *Boccalini* would have made ſuch a Noiſe *for miſſing a Page or two in* Guicciardin's *War of Piſa*? Do you in earneſt think Dr. *St.* ſhould take ſuch pains to conceal that which every one knows, that the *Arians* fixed their *hopes of Salvation on Chriſt, and expected him to come to Judgment*? What wonderful Diſcovery is this, which *T. G.* hath made? Nay, Dr. *St.* himſelf takes notice of this Objection, *that they did give a higher degree of Worſhip to Chriſt, than any do to Saints*; and returns this Anſwer to it, That they did only give a *degree* of *Worſhip* proportionable to the degrees of Excellency ſuppoſed to be in him, far above any other Creatures whatſoever. But ſtill that *Worſhip* was *inferior* to that which they gave to *God* the *Father*; and at the higheſt, ſuch as the *Platoniſts* gave to their *Cœleſtial Deities*. And although the *Arians* did *invocate Chriſt*, and put their truſt in him, yet they ſtill ſuppoſed him to be a *Creature*, and therefore believed that all the *Power* and *Authority* he had, was given to him: So that the *Worſhip* they gave to *Chriſt*, muſt be *inferior* to that *Honour* they gave to the *Supreme God*, whom they believed to be *Supreme*, *Abſolute*, and *Independent*.

Defence, p. 519.

*R. P. T. G.* takes notice of this Anſwer, and objects two things againſt it. Firſt, *That it ſtands too far off from the words of* Nyſſen, *at the diſtance of* 350 *Pages*; *and ſo proves a very late Salve for ſo old a Wound.*

Dial. p. 247.

*R. P.*

*P. D.* Especially, considering how poor *Nyssen* lay a bleeding all that while. Is it not enough for us to answer *Objections*, unless we put them just in the Page you would have them, after the way of *Objections* and *Solutions*? I pity the hard Fate of the *Laconian* that hath 350 Leaves to turn over, longer than the *War* of *Pisa*. O for the *Gallies!* But I hope he will consider better of it.

*R. P.* You may Jest as you please at this Answer, but the second is a very solid one; for *T. G.* shews *the Parallel to be inconsistent, both with the Practice of the* Arians, *and Doctrine of the Fathers.*

*P. D.* What Parallel doth he mean? Dr. *St.* proves from hence *Inferior Relative Worship* given to a *Creature* to be *Idolatry*, in the *sense* of the *Fathers*. Is this true, or is it not?

*R. P.* You have not Patience to hear *T. G.*'s Answer out. For,

1. He saith, *The Fathers do acknowledge a Worship due to the Saints, and particularly* Gregory Nyssen, *in an Oration produced by him: And therefore if they had condemned the* Arians *of Idolatry, for giving only a like Worship to Christ, though in a higher degree, they had condemned themselves for the like Crime.* Dial. p. 248, &c.

2. *The* Arians *made no such Apology for themselves, as the Doctor makes for them,* viz. *That they gave Sovereign and Absolute Worship to God, and only Inferior and Relative Worship to Christ.*

3. *Why might not the generality at least believe Christ to be of a Superior Order, so as to have true Divinity in him, as the Heathens did of their lesser Gods; and that being assumed as a Consort in the Empire, absolute Divine Honour was due to him?*

4. *They were chargeable with Idolatry, because they did avowedly give those Acts of Worship to Christ, believing him to be a Creature; which by the common Consent, and publick Practice of Christians, from whence Exterior Signs in the Duties of Religion receive their Determination, were understood to be due only to God Incarnate. Which makes their Case very much different from that of the Church of* Rome, *which gave to Saints and Images only such Acts of Worship, as by the common Use and Practice of the Christian World before* Luther, *were determined and understood, when applied to Saints and Images, to express an inferior degree of Reverence or Worship, than what is due to God himself.* This is the Substance of *T. G.*'s Answer.

*P. D.* I confess *T. G.* now offers something worthy a serious Debate. Which may be reduced to these Two Things.

1. What those *Acts* of *Worship* were, which the *Arians* were charged with *Idolatry* for giving to *Christ*, supposing him a *Creature*.

2. How far the *Church* of *Rome* is liable to the same Charge, for the *Worship* she gives to *Saints* and *Images*.

1. For the *Acts* of *Worship* which the *Arians* were charged with *Idolatry*, in giving to *Christ* as a *Creature*. The Strength of *T. G.*'s Answer lies in Two Things.

1. *That they were given absolutely to Christ, as a lesser God.*

2. *That they were such Acts, which by the consent of the Church did signifie proper Divine Worship.*

1. Let us consider whether the *Worship* given to Christ could be *absolute*, upon their Supposition that Christ was a *Creature*. *T. G.* speaks somewhat faintly in this Matter; at first saying only, *Why might it not be absolute? at least as to the generality?* But afterwards he takes Heart, and says roundly, *That the Fathers evermore charge the* Arians *for giving absolute* Dial. p. 250.

*absolute Divine Worship to Christ, although they believed him to be of a different Nature from the Supreme God; which he hopes is far enough from the Doctor's Relative or Inferior Worship.* But I am very far from being satisfied with this Answer. For I pray tell me wherein lies the difference between *Sovereign Worship*, and *Inferior*: In *Acts* of the *Mind*, or in *External Acts*?

*R. P.* In *Internal* doubtless, on *T. G.*'s Principles, who makes *External Acts to signifie according to the Determination of the Church.*

*P. D.* What are those *Internal Acts* wherein the *Worship* of the *Supreme God* consists?

*R. P.* A *due esteem* of his Excellency, and *suitable Affection* to it.

*P. D.* Must not this *due Esteem* distinguish him from all *Creatures*?

*R. P.* Yes, surely; for otherwise it can be no *due Esteem*; the distance being infinite between God and his Creatures.

*P. D.* Can a Man then have an *equal Esteem* of *God*, and a *Creature* which he acknowledges to be made by him?

*R. P.* Certainly not.

*P. D.* Then it must be *unequal*, according to the difference of *uncreated* and *created Excellencies.*

*R. P.* Yes.

*P. D.* Then the *Worship* must be *unequal*; and that which is given to a *Creature* must be *Inferior Worship.*

*R. P.* But *T. G.* saith, *they might believe true Divinity to be in him, as the Heathens did of their lesser Gods.*

*P. D. True Divinity!* What is that, when they believed him to be a *Creature*? Did they take him for an *uncreated Creature*? For that can be no *true Divinity* which is not *uncreated*; and yet you confess they owned *Christ* to be a *Creature.* What *Nonsense* and *Contradiction* would *T. G.* cry out upon, if Dr. *St.* had ever said any such thing?

*R. P. Might not they believe Christ to be assumed as Consort in the Empire, and so absolute Divine Honour to be due to him?*

*P. D.* What do you mean by this *absolute Divine Honour?* For I have already proved it must be *Inferior Worship.*

*R. P.* I do suppose *Absolute Divine Honour* is that which is given to a Being on the account of *its own Excellency*, and *Relative* from the *respect* it hath to another.

*P. D.* But whether *Absolute* or *Relative*, it is *proper Divine Honour* you mean. And doth not that imply an *Esteem* of proper *Divine Excellency*, and is not that *proper to God* alone and uncreated? How then can this *absolute Divine Honour* be given to a *Created Being*?

*R. P.* How did the *Gentiles* to their *false Gods*?

*P. D.* Just as the *Arians*, for they made Distinctions in their Worship; as will appear when we come to that Subject.

*R. P.* What do you make then this *Worship* of the *Arians* to be?

*P. D.* An *Inferior* and *Relative Worship*; for they supposed they worshipped *God*, when they gave those *Acts* of *Worship* to *Christ*, which were agreeable to the Excellencies that were in him.

*R. P.* But (2.) *Those Acts were such, as by the consent of the Church were understood to be due only to God Incarnate.*

*P. D.* Here we are to know, both what these *Acts* were, and what Power the Church hath to impose a *Signification* upon them.

Dial. p. 249, 251. *R. P. T. G.* names these. 1. *Worshipping and serving him with* Latria. 2. *Putting their trust in him as Mediator of Redemption.* 3. *Invoking him as the Judge of the quick and the dead*, &c.

*P. D.*

*P. D.* What means this &c. I am afraid here is ſomething beyond the Trick about *Gregory Nyſſen*, which lies under this *Dragon's Tail.* Are theſe all which Dr. *St.* mentioned ?

*R. P.* I know not that ; if you know more, I am ſure to hear of it.

*P. D.* You are not miſtaken ; for Dr. *St.* had ſhewed at large, (1.) That External *Adoration* was one of thoſe things which the Fathers charged the *Arians* with *Idolatry* for giving to *Chriſt*, ſuppoſing him to be a *Creature* ; from *Peter's* forbidding *Cornelius*, and the *Angel* St. *John*, becauſe this is only proper to *God* ; from the plain Teſtimonies of *Athanaſius*, *Epiphanius*, and St. *Cyril.* (2.) That *Invocation* of *Chriſt* as a *Mediator* of *Interceſſion*, was condemned as *Idolatry* in *the* Arians. *Athanaſius* ſuppoſes *it inconſiſtent with Chriſtianity to join Chriſt, if he were a Creature, in our Prayers, together with God.* (3.) That they made no ſuch diſtinction of worſhipping and ſerving with *Latria*, as *T. G.* inſinuates : For he ſhews from the Teſtimonies of *Athanaſius*, and even *Gregory Nyſſen*, St. *Cyril* and *Theodoret*, that the very Worſhip which they condemn for *Idolatry* is called *Doulia* by them. And therefore theſe are meer Shifts and Evaſions which do not remove the Difficulty at all. I deny not, but *they did put their truſt in Chriſt for Salvation, and expect his coming to judge the quick and the dead :* But I ſay theſe were but Expreſſions ſuitable to the Apprehenſions they had of his Excellencies above any other *Creatures*, but ſtill inferior to *Gods* : And the Fathers did not charge them with *Idolatry* meerly for theſe *Acts*, but for the other likewiſe mentioned before.

Defence, P. 165, 175, 178. P. 166. P. 163. P. 171. P. 178. P. 180.

*R. P.* But *T. G.* hath a Reſerve ſtill behind, viz. *That it is in the Churches Power to determine the Signification of External Acts of Worſhip, what belongs to Sovereign or proper Divine Worſhip, and what to Inferior Worſhip ; that at that time the Church might take thoſe for Acts of Divine Worſhip which afterwards by conſent of the Church came only to ſignifie Inferior Acts of Worſhip when applied to Creatures ; and therefore the Argument cannot hold from that time to After-Ages.*

*P. D.* I think you have hit upon *T. G.*'s meaning ; and in truth it is the only thing to be ſaid in the Caſe : For if *Idolatry* be a thing in the *Churches Power* to determine, it is the only way in the World for the Church of *Rome* to free her ſelf (ſuppoſing that Power to be lodged in her); but if it ſhould happen that the *Law* of *God*, the *Conſent* of *Nations*, the *Reaſon* of *Divine Worſhip*, and the *Practice* of the *Primitive Church*, have determined *Idolatry* antecedently to the Power of the *preſent Church* ; What a Caſe are you then in ? The guilt of *Idolatry* muſt lie heavily upon you ; and if it be ſo great a *Sin* as your own *Schoolmen* determine, you have a great deal to anſwer for, notwithſtanding all the Tricks and Evaſions of *T. G.* But why doth not *T. G.* make the External *Acts* of *Theft*, *Adultery*, *Murder* and *Perjury*, as much under the *Churches Power* as thoſe of *Idolatry* ? But I forbear now, ſuppoſing that we ſhall meet with this uſeful Notion again before we end this Debate.

*R. P.* You are miſtaken, if you think *T. G.* had no other Anſwer to give : For he ſaith, *They could not be underſtood of that Worſhip which our Church gives to Saints, becauſe they acknowledge an Inferior Worſhip due to the Saints* ; for which he quotes St. *Auſtin*, *Gregory Nazianzen*, St. *Hierom*, and *Gregory Nyſſen.*

*P. D.* Had *T. G.* the Confidence to quote St. *Auguſtin* again for this, when Dr. *St.* purpoſely anſwered this very Teſtimony in his Book which *T. G* pretends here to anſwer, and proves evidently from him, *that no*

Defence, p. 336. *Worſhip was then given to the Saints* ? And to all this *T. G.* returns nothing, but however he brings the ſame Teſtimony again ; as whole and as ſound, and as much to the purpoſe as ever. *Gregory Nazianzen* is quoted at peradventure, for I remember nothing in the *Orat. de Nat. Chriſt.* to that purpoſe, although I lately read it over. St. *Hierom* ſpeaks only of *Reverencing the Sepulchres of the Martyrs* ; but all the weight lies upon *Gregory Nyſſen* ; and what, I pray, ſaith this ſingle Witneſs to the Buſineſs ?

*R. P.* More than you will be willing to hear, or able to anſwer : For in his *Oration* upon St. *Theodore*, that *great and holy Martyr*, (*which even* Rivetus *himſelf, that capricious Fanatick in Criticiſm, doth not queſtion to be his genuine Work*) *he commends the Peoples Devotion to the Martyrs, he deſcribes the Magnificent Structure of the Temple, the pieces of Sculpture in it, and eſpecially the Picture of the Martyr ; then coming to the Shrine he ſhews the Eſteem they had for his Relicks ; and if they were admitted to touch his Body, they embrace it as if they beheld it yet alive, and weeping over it as if he were whole before them, they ſollicit his Supplication and Interceſſion, beſeeching him as a Champion of God, and invocating him as one that could obtain Bleſſings when he would for them. And then he dilates himſelf upon the Acts of the Martyr, and the great Benefits they received by him : And at the end of his Oration addreſſes himſelf to him in theſe words*, We ſtand in need of many Benefits, do thou intercede and deprecate with our common King and Lord for thy Country. Do thou as a Soldier fight in our Defence : And in caſe there be need of greater Interceſſion, call an Aſſembly of thy Brother Martyrs ; let the Prayers of many Juſt Perſons expiate the Sins of Multitudes of Offenders. Admoniſh *Peter*, excite *Paul*, and *John* alſo the beloved Diſciple, to be Sollicitors for the Churches they have founded ; that Idolatry may not lift up its Head, that Hereſies may not overgrow the Vineyard, *&c.* But by the Power of thine, and thy Fellows Interceſſion, O admirable Man, and eminent among Martyrs, the Chriſtian Church may be a plentiful Field of Harveſt, *&c.* Dial. p. 238.

Dial. p. 242. *If Dr.* St. *had been preſent at this Oration*, ſaith *T. G. how may we think would his Zeal have urged him to have cried out Idolatry, flat Idolatry, very real Idolatry, meer Heatheniſh Idolatry.*

*P. D.* I am not of your Mind in this ; for I ſuppoſe he would have conſidered the Allowances to be made for an Eloquent Perſon in a *Panegyrical Oration* ; when things are amplified, heightned, improved, with all the moſt moving Figures and Strains of *Rhetorick*, to excite the Auditors Admiration and Affection to the Party commended. And he muſt be a great Stranger to the Schools of *Eloquence*, that will form *Doctrines* and *Devotions* from *Apoſtrophe's* and *Proſopopeia's*. I do not think Dr. *St.* would have charged *Cicero* a jot the more for *Idolatry*, for his praying to the *Hills* and *Woods* of *Alba*, *Vos Albani tumuli atque luci, oro atque obteſtor* : What! *flat Idolatry*! *Heatheniſh Idolatry* ! *praying to Hills and Woods.* No ſuch Matter : For ſo *Rhetoricians* will tell *T. G.* what great Scope *Orators* may take in the Repreſentation of Perſons, and the things done by them ; and how mightily thoſe Figures both adorn the Oration, and move the Auditors : But withal, that theſe are Figures it is very eaſie to exceed in, and it requires great Judgment to manage them with a due Decorum. If it were needful for *T. G.* I could produce the Teſtimonies of both *Greek* and *Latin Rhetoricians* to this purpoſe. All the Queſtion is, whether *Gregory Nyſſen* ſpake like an Orator in theſe Expreſſions ; for which we muſt conſider the Character of the Perſon, and the *Occaſion* of ſpeaking. As to *Gregory Nyſſen*, *Gregory Nazianzen* ſeverely rebukes him in a whole *Epiſtle for affecting more the Glo-*

ry

*ry of an Orator, than of a Christian*; and this *after he was a Priest, and devoted to the service of Christ; insomuch that many Christians were very much offended at him.* And what wonder is it to find such a Person, on such an *Occasion* as making a *Panegyrical Oration* on a *Martyr*, laying on all his Colours, opening his perfuming Pots, and using more the Figures of an *Orator*, than the Exactness of a *Divine?* Nay, it was become so general a Custom among their Eloquent Men to exceed in their *Panegyrical Orations*, that I find *Theodoret* quoted for saying, *No Rule of Doctrine is to be taken from them.* And it is agreed by your *Divines* as well as our own, *That the Fathers in their popular Orations do make use of such bold Figures, as are not to be made a Foundation for Doctrines to be taken from them.* Therefore this *Apostrophe* to *Theodorus* by *Gregory Nyssen*, is no Argument to prove *Invocation* of *Saints*, there being a great difference between *Flowers* of *Rhetorick*, and *Forms* of *Devotion.*

Gregory Naz Ep. 43.

Theod. Dial. 3.

*R. P. But he commends the Devotion of the People to the Martyrs, and calls it a Pure Worship.*

*P. D.* That he might well do, as the Solemnities of the *Martyrs* were observed out of Honour to *God* and the *Christian Religion*: For then the Christians met at the Tombs of the Martyrs, to perform the publick Worship of *God* there; and afterwards erected Churches upon their Memories, so that the place, the time, the occasion of meeting was for the Honour of the Martyrs, but the Worship was given to *God* alone.

*R. P. Doth not* Gregory Nyssen *take notice of the Peoples soliciting his Supplication and Intercession with God for them, as their Champion*, &c.

*P. D.* I grant he doth so; but observe his Words: He saith, *the People when they touch any part of his Body*, (which was very rarely granted) *they embraced it, as if it had been living, and wept over it*; and then he adds ὡς ὁλοκλήρῳ καὶ φαινομένῳ τῷ μάρτυρι, ἢ τὸ πρεσβεύειν ἱκεσίαν προτάττοντι, ὡς δορυφόρον τοῦ θεοῦ, παρακαλοῦντες, ὡς λαμβάνοντα τὰς δωρεὰς ὅταν ἐθέλῃ ὑπερκαλούμενοι. *As if he had been whole, and appeared before them,* (which last word φαινομένῳ *T. G.* very conveniently left out; which I leave to the Reader to judge of, as a Testimony of *T. G.*'s Sincerity, at the very same time he charges Dr. *St.* for the same Fault) *they sollicit his Intercession, beseeching him as the Champion of God, and calling upon him as one that received Gifts when he pleased.* I do not think this Superstition of the People was to be excused, which began most early to appear in the Parts of *Cappadocia* and *Pontus*; and the reason of it is not hard to give, *from the turning Heathen Festivals into Christian Solemnities to the Martyrs*, of which *Gregory Nyssen* speaks in the Life of *Gregory Thaumaturgus.* But however, this was not any solemn Invocation of him, as a part of *Religious Worship*, but an *occasional* and *rare thing*, and done upon Supposition, as if he had been alive, and then present among them. And that the Practice of these Men, who seemed most to make Addresses to *Saints* in the Fourth *Century*, did differ from the Invocation of *Saints* in your Church, I shall make appear by these Particulars.

Gregory Nyss. in vit. Greg. p. 574.

1. *Invocation* of *Saints* is made a solemn part of *Religious Worship* in the Church of *Rome.* For which, we do not run to some *extravagant Expressions* of your *Preachers*, nor barely to the *Ave Maries* they use in their Pulpits; of which no single Instance can be produced out of *Antiquity*, but to the publick, solemn Authorized Offices of your *Church.* And although you may say, the Church is not answerable for the Indiscretion of Preachers, or the Figures of Poets, yet certainly she is for all

standing

ſtanding and allowed *Offices* of *Divine Worſhip*. And this is that we charge you with, that by this you make *Religious Worſhip* of the *Creatures*, a part of your conſtant and ſolemn *Worſhip*. Even in the *Maſs* it ſelf, you begin with Confeſſion to *God*, and to his *Creatures* (which *Athanaſius* accounted ſo great an Impiety, *to join God and his Creature together in an Act of Worſhip*) and afterwards pray to them. And although in the plain *Canon* of the *Maſs*, you pretend there is ſcarce any, or but twice or thrice, a direct Invocation of the *Saints*; yet upon *Occaſional* and *Anniverſary Maſſes*, ſuch Invocation is very frequent, as in the *Maſſes* of the Feſtivals of the *Bleſſed Virgin*, which are many in the Year; the *Maſs* for Women with Child, the *Maſſes* of the *Apoſtles*, the Angel *Michael*, and many Saints; which it were tedious to repeat. It would be endleſs to give an Account how much of your *Breviaries*, *Hours*, *Litanies*, and private Offices of Devotion is ſtuffed out with formal Addreſſes to Saints. If you but caſt your Eye on any of the *Offices* of the *Bleſſed Virgin*, you cannot queſtion the truth of this. Now I pray tell me, where you meet with any like this in Antiquity; you may pick up ſome Flouriſhes of *Orators* or *Poets* in the Fourth *Century*, but what are theſe to the ſtanding *Offices* of the Church, which are the Standard of *Divine Worſhip*? Name me any one *Liturgy* of the Church, which is Authentick, that had the Name of any *Saint* or *Creature* in it by way of Invocation, before the time of *Petrus Fullo*, who is no Author to be gloried in. And of him indeed *Nicephorus* ſaith, *That he firſt brought the Invocation of the Bleſſed Virgin into the Prayers of the Church.* Before his time, the Fathers utterly deny there was any Invocation of *Saints* in the *Prayers* of the *Faithful*, as Dr. *St.* hath evidently proved from St. *Auguſtin*: And methinks *T. G.* ſhould have ſaid ſomething or other to it, and not think this poor ſingle Teſtimony of *Gregory Nyſſen* would overthrow all.

Niceph. Calliſt. l. 15. c. 28. Defence, p. 340, to 347.

2. The Invocation of *Saints* in your Church is *direct* and *formal*, not meerly by way of *deſire to pray for them*, but *to beſtow Bleſſings upon them.* Of which Dr. *St.* hath produced ſeveral late Inſtances in Books of *Devotion*, now in uſe here in *England*; to which many more might be added, if it were needful. And it is a wonder to me, that any Man who hath looked into the *Offices* of the *Bleſſed Virgin*, can make the leaſt doubt of this. And conſidering the Titles given her in the *Roman* Church, it were a Diſparagement to her, not *to pray directly to her for Bleſſings.* For if ſhe be the *Fountain of Grace and Mercy*, the *Mother of Conſolation*, the *Safety of all that truſt in her*, the *Diſpenſer of Graces to whom ſhe pleaſes*, the *Queen of Heaven, to whom all Power is committed*, the *Mediatrix between her Son and us*; as ſhe is ſtiled in the *Roman* Church; why may not Men *pray as directly* to her as to *Chriſt* himſelf? As long as theſe and many other Titles are owned in their *Prayers*, in their Sacred *Hymns*, in their *Commentators* on *Scripture*, and not meerly in their *Poets* and *Orators*. Why doth *T. G.* go about to deceive the World, in making it believe that all their *Invocation* is only *praying to pray for them*? Which is all that is pretended to be uſed in the Ancient Church. And *Caſſander* thinks *they were rather Wiſhes and Deſires than Prayers*; for which he gives a very good Reaſon, viz. *That there was a Condition expreſſed by them*; ſuch as that of *Gregory Nazianzen* in his *Oration* on his Siſter *Gorgonia*. *If thou haſt any regard to our Affairs*, and *if this be part of the Reward of holy Souls; to be ſenſible of things done below, receive this Office of Kindneſs from me.* Which ſhews they had no Confidence or Aſſurance that

Defence, p. 293. to 305.

Caſſand. Ep. 19. Op. p. 1109.

that the *Saints* in *Heaven* did understand our Affairs, and therefore all Expressions of this kind in them were rather *Wishes* than *Prayers*. And even *Gregory Nyssen* in this *Oration* upon *Theodore* supposes, *That unless he came down from above wherever he was, whether in the Æthereal Region, or Celestial, or Angelical, and were actually present among them, he could not understand the Honours that were done him, nor the Addresses they made to him.* And when they did express such an Uncertainty as this, at the same time they made these Addresses towards the *Conclusion* of their *Orations*, after the manner of *Orators*, it is plain they are to be understood rather for *Rhetorical Wishes*, than *formal Invocations*. Now let any Man compare this Doubtfulness of the Ancients, with the Confidence expressed in the Church of *Rome*, when they declare it to be *de Fide*, *that the Saints do hear them*, (although the manner be not) and then judge whether their Practices can be of the same kind.

Gregory Nyssen Orat. in Theod. p. 585.

3. The *Invocation* of *Saints* in your Church, doth imply *inward submission to a Creature*; and therefore goes very much beyond the Addresses of the Ancients. There are Three things which prove this *Inward Submission* to a *Creature* in the *Invocation* of *Saints*. 1. *Inward Devotion* to them. 2. An acknowledged Superiority over them. 3. An *Intention* to give them *Divine Worship*.

1. *Inward Devotion*. For even *Mental Prayers to Saints* are allowed by the Council of *Trent*, as Dr. *St.* told *T. G.* of which he takes no notice, and yet quarrels with him for two other Passages in the same place. Must we impute this to *a casual Undulation of the Visual Rays*, as *T. G.* very finely expresseth it? I am afraid there was some other Cause for it. For since that Council allows *Internal Prayers to Saints*, it must not only certainly suppose their knowledge of the *Heart*, but a due submission of our *Souls* to them; which *inward Prayer* doth import. And therefore *suppliciter invocare tam voce quàm mente*, which are the Words of the Council of *Trent*, doth not only imply *formal Invocation*, but *internal Submission*; both which do belong to *Suppliants*.

Defence, p. 293. Dial. p. 256.

2. An acknowledged *Superiority* over them; which appears by that Authority and Government which they attribute to them, with respect to particular Places and Things. Whereby they make the *Saints* not bare *Intercessors*, but *Tutelar Deities*, and they invocate them as such. *T. G.* saith, *they do not make them Authors of those Blessings*; not Originally, and Independently; but Subordinately and Ministerially they do. And if this be not *Idolatry*, no Worship of the Inferior Deities among the Heathens was so. *Lipsius* was no Fool when he made the *Blessed Virgin* a *Tutelar Deity*; and the Popes surely understand their own Religion, when they Canonize particular *Saints* to be Patrons of such Places; which may be seen in some of the latest *Canonizations*. As of St. *Rosa*, that admirable Saint of *Peru*, and others.

Dial. p. 238.

3. An *Intention* to give *Divine Worship* to them. For what else can be meant by *that eminent kind of Adoration*, which *Bellarmine* saith *doth belong to them*; *that Divine Worship*, which *Azorius* saith, *you give to the Saints*; and *Serrarius* saith, *many of the wisest Persons among you say, that* Latria *and* Doulia *proceed both from the same Vertue of Religion*; that is, they are of the same kind. So that this is not meerly the Superstition of the *Vulgar*, but the Judgment of the *wisest among you*, if *Serrarius* his Judgment may be taken. I will not dissemble what *B. Forbes* observes, *that some of the Schoolmen do make the Invocation of Saints not to flow from the vertue of Religion, but another of their own making, called* Singularis Observan-

D. Forbes Consid. modest. & pacif. p. 293. P. 297.

Obſervantia. But this is only a Trick found out to avoid the Imputation of *Idolatry*, which they thought would fall juſtly upon them, if they made the *Worſhip* to be of the ſame kind, although of a different degree: Since nothing can be plainer in Antiquity, than that all *truly Religious Worſhip* belongs only to *God*, and cannot be given to a *Creature* without the Guilt of *Idolatry*. For even in the ſame Age wherein *Gregory Nyſſen* lived, the Council of *Laodicea* declared *the Invocation of Angels to be Idolatry*; ſo *Theodoret* expreſſeth the Senſe of that *Council*, who certainly underſtood the meaning of it; τοῖς Ἀγγέλοις προσεύχεσθαι, are his Words, which he makes to be all one with τὸς Ἀγγέλους σέβειν. So that *Praying to them* is that part of *Divine Worſhip* which was condemned for *Idolatry*, being given to *Angels*.

Concil. Laodic. c. 35. Theod. in Col 2. 18.

*T. G.* Catholl. no Idol. p. 384.

*R. P.* T. G. ſaith, *This was a Practice of nominating Angels*, which he ſaith, *cannot with any ſhew of probability be underſtood of that Worſhip, which the Holy Catholick Church gives to Holy Angels.*

*P. D.* Good Sir, his *Reaſon*; for to my Apprehenſion it comes as home to the Practice of the Church of *Rome*, as may be.

*R. P.* (1.) *Becauſe the Council ſpeaks of ſuch as excluded our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, making private Aſſemblies; which Words Dr.* St. *conveniently omitted.*

*P. D.* Did he ſo? Let us hear them at length. *That Chriſtians ought not to forſake the Church of God, and go aſide, to invocate Angels, or make unlawful Conventicles; If any one be found practiſing this ſecret Idolatry, let him be accurſed; becauſe he hath forſaken our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, the Son of God, and betaken himſelf to Idolatry.* The Council ſpeaks this of a ſort of Chriſtians, who yet were guilty of *Idolatry* in *praying to Angels*; therefore *Praying* to *Angels* is *Idolatry*.

*R. P. Yes, ſuch Praying to Angels as* Theodoret *ſpeaks of, upon account that the Law was delivered by them, or that God being Inviſible and Incomprehenſible, cannot be approached but by the Angels.*

*P. D.* Will *T. G.* ſtand to it, that this is *Idolatry*? Then it muſt be *Idolatry* in the Nature of the Thing, or by ſome poſitive Law; if the latter, we ſee the Council of *Laodicea* accounts it *equal Idolatry* among *Chriſtians* as before: If the former, then *Praying* to a *Creature* is *Idolatry* in the Nature of the Thing. Which is a very fair Conceſſion, and I ſuppoſe the Church of *Rome* will con him no thanks for.

*R. P. But it is Idolatry on thoſe Accounts I mentioned.*

*P. D.* On what, I pray? *Becauſe the Law was delivered by them*? How is that poſſible on *T. G.*'s Principles, when they were only *God's Miniſters* therein? And ſo *Praying* to *God's Miniſters* in Heaven is *Idolatry*; how then will Praying to *Saints* eſcape?

*R. P.* But *Theodoret* adds, *they brought us Salvation thereby.*

*P. D.* Only *Miniſterially*; and this alters not the Caſe.

*R. P. But ſuppoſe they thought Acceſs to God was only by them?*

*P. D.* What then? That might prove them *no Chriſtians*, but doth it prove them *Idolaters*? Suppoſe they were *Jews*, muſt they therefore needs be *Idolaters*?

*R. P.* But *T. G.* ſaith, *good Angels are not to be worſhipped, but in Subordination to Chriſt the Head, nor their Prayers to be deſired as efficacious for us, but through his Merits.*

*P. D.* And what follows? *Therefore leaving out Chriſt is Idolatry*? Doth *T. G.* talk at this rate, and hope to excuſe the Church of *Rome* from *Idolatry*? For I ſtill ask, what it was which made their *Worſhip* of

*Angels*

*Angels Idolatry*? *Leaving out of Chriſt* might make it *Judaiſm* or *Heatheniſm*, but how comes it to be *Idolatry*?

*R. P.* I think you will never be ſatisfied.

*P. D.* Not with ſuch Anſwers, I aſſure you.

*R. P. Baronius* ſaith, *Theodoret was miſtaken; and that this Canon is to be underſtood of Heathen Idolatry; and that the Oratories of* Michael *which* Theodoret *ſaith were built by thoſe Idolaters, were in truth built by very good Catholicks.*

*P D.* This is plain dealing: And *Baronius* ſaw well enough, there was no way to juſtify the *Church* of *Rome*, but by condemning *Theodoret*: But I leave it to any Man's Conſideration, whether *Theodoret*, whoſe diſtance was not great, either in Age or Place, did not better underſtand the meaning of this *Council*; and the Practices of thoſe Times and Places, than *Baronius*; and whether his Judgment be not rather to be taken, than that of a Man, who turns every Stone to avoid a Difficulty, which he ſaw could no otherwiſe be anſwered.

*R. P.* (2.) *How can this be the meaning of the Council of* Laodicea, *when it declares for the honouring and celebrating the Feaſt-days of the Martyrs*?

*P. D.* Doth *T. G.* call this a ſecond *Reaſon*? Where lyes the Conſequence? The *Council* of *Laodicea* was for *honouring the Feaſt-days of the Martyrs*, therefore the *praying to Angels is not condemned by it for Idolatry*. As though there were no way of celebrating their *Feſtivals*, but *by praying to Saints and Angels*. When *T. G.* proves that *meeting* at their *Memories* on their *Anniverſary days*, and *praiſing God for them*, and *rehearſing their Acts*, was no keeping their *Feſtivals*, without *praying to them*; he will do ſomething towards making this look like a *Reaſon*. In the mean time, let the Reader conſider whether *praying* to *Saints* was practiſed by *Greg. Nyſſen*, when praying to *Angels* about the ſame time by the *Council* of *Laodicea* is condemned for *Idolatry*. But this is not all which I have to ſay; for *Gregory Nyſſen*'s Practice doth excuſe the modern *Invocation* of *Saints* from *Idolatry*: I deſire to know whether it was ſingular in him, or the *ſenſe* of the *Church* of that Age?

*R. P.* No doubt *T. G.* brings it for an Inſtance of the *Senſe* of the *Church*: For it were to no great purpoſe to produce a *ſingular Opinion* or *Practice* of one Man, condemned by the reſt of the Church.

*P. D.* Then I ask, whether *offering up ones ſelf*, or *offering up a Cake* to a *Saint*, be the *greater Idolatry*?

*R. P.* A *Man's ſelf*, certainly.

*P. D.* Do not they who *devote* themſelves to a *particular Saint*, chuſing her for their *perpetual Patroneſs*, *vowing* themſelves to be her *ſlaves*, offer up *themſelves* to her?

*R. P.* What would you have?

*P. D.* I will tell you; *Epiphanius* who lived in the ſame *Age* with *Greg. Nyſſen*, condemns thoſe for *rank Idolaters*, *who offered up Cakes to the B. Virgin*; and do you think he would have excuſed thoſe who *offered up themſelves and their devotions* to her? And at the ſame time he condemns *the worſhip both of Saints and Angels*, in the places produced by Dr. *St.* What anſwer hath *T. G.* made to this? Def. p. 175, to p. 180.

*R. P.* I do not remember he takes notice of it.

*P. D. T. G.* would make an excellent Commentator; for he knows how to paſs over a hard place, as well as any I have met with. But

ſtill I have one queſtion more. Whether *Greg. Nyſſen* did argue well againſt the *Arians* or not?

*R. P.* Why ſhould you queſtion that?

*P. D.* Do you think he ſpake conſiſtently to himſelf? Or, if not, is his Opinion to be taken from a *Panegyrical Oration*, or a *ſtrict Diſpute*?

*R. P.* A *ſtrict Diſpute*; for then men conſider every Word, and the Conſequence of it.

*P. D. Greg. Nyſſen* goes upon this Principle, *To give Divine Worſhip to a Creature is Idolatry; but the* Arians *in worſhipping Chriſt as a Creature do give Divine Worſhip to a Creature*: therefore, &c. To make good the Particulars of this Charge, we muſt conſider what *Greg. Nyſſen* makes to be the *Parts* of *Divine Worſhip*; and if I can prove, that *Greg. Nyſſen* doth make *Prayer* to be ſuch a *Part* of *Divine Worſhip*, then by neceſſary Conſequence he makes *praying to a Creature* to be *Idolatry*. Now it is very well known that *Greg. Nyſſen* in ſeveral places makes *Prayer* with *Suplication to be peculiar to God*; therefore he calls it *a converſing with God; a requeſt of good things with Supplication unto God*. In which he agrees with the reſt of the *Fathers*, who made *Religious Invocation* peculiar to God. *Sed tamen tu ſolus Domine invocandus es*, ſaith S. *Ambroſe. I do not pray to any beſides thy ſelf*; ſaith *Ephreem Syrus* in the *Officium Diurnum* of the *Maronites*. *We call not on the Name of this Man or that Man*, ſaith S. *Chryſoſtom*, *but on the Name of the Lord. This is an Honour*, he ſaith, *God hath reſerved to himſelf, to call upon him, and will not give it to Angels or Arch-Angels*; as he elſewhere ſpeaks. *Unto God alone do we pray*, ſaith the *Greek Catena* on the *fifth Pſalm*. *To whom ſhall I call but unto thee*, ſaith St. *Auguſtin*. *This is the beſt Sacrifice we can offer unto God*, ſay *Clemens* of *Alexandria* and *Tertullian*. It were eaſy to produce many more Teſtimonies to this purpoſe, if theſe be not ſufficient to prove, that in *Greg. Nyſſen's* Age, as well as *before*, *Prayer* was looked on as a *peculiar* part of *Divine Worſhip*.

*Bell. de bonis oper. in particul. l. 1. c. 1.* *Greg. Nyſſen orat. 1. de orat.* *Orat. 2. de orat. Dom.* *Tract. 2. de inſcript.* Pſal. c. 3. *Ambroſ. de obit. Theod.* Chryſoſt. in 1 Cor. Hom. 1. in Coloſſ. 3. Hom. 9. Aug. Confeſſ. l. 1. c. 5. Clem. ſtrom. l. 7. Tertul. Apol. c. 30.

*R. P.* To what purpoſe? ſince no body denies, *that Prayer as it is a Means to obtain Bleſſings from God as the Author of them, is Peculiar to God.*

*P. D.* This Anſwer doth not take off the force of the Argument. For *Prayer* may be conſidered two ways. 1. As a *Means* to obtain *Bleſſings*. 2. As a ſolemn *Part* of *Divine Worſhip*. Now if they reſerved *Prayer* to *God*, on the latter Account, then it follows, that whatever *Invocation* doth take off from the *peculiarity* of this *Part* of *External Worſhip*, is againſt the Deſign of the *Fathers*. So *Origen* argues, that *Invocation and Adoration do imply each other*. Invocare nomen domini & adorare Deum unum atque idem eſt. *To invocate God and to adore him is all one*; from whence he proves *that thoſe who invocate Chriſt do adore him*. And where the *Church* of *Smyrna* declares in her *Epiſtle* about the *Martyrdom* of *Polycarp*, that they did not *worſhip any other but Chriſt*; the old *Latin* Tranſlation renders it, *neque alteri cuiquam precem orationis impendere*. And *Theodoret* makes *praying to Angels*, and the *worſhipping* of *them* the ſame thing. So that *Prayer* was looked on as a *Part* of *Adoration*; therefore whoſoever gives the *external Worſhip* of *Prayer* to another beſides *God*, doth give to a *Creature* that which belongs to *God*.

Orig 1. 8. in Epiſt. ad Rom. c. 10.

*R. P.* I know not what you mean, I pray explain your ſelf more.

*P. D.* Is not *God* worſhipped ſolemnly by us, when we joyn together in Prayer to him?

*R. P.* Yes.

*R. P.* Yes.

*P. D.* Is not this External *Worſhip*, that which the *Fathers* mean, by the *Adoration* that is implied in *Prayer*?

*R. P.* Suppoſe it be.

*P. D.* Wherein lies this *External Worſhip*? Is it not that we meet together, and join in Acts of *Devotion*, to teſtify our Acknowledgment of *God*'s *Sovereignty* and *Dependance* upon him?

*R. P.* What then?

*P. D.* Then whoſoever do uſe the ſame External *Acts* of *Worſhip* to a *Creature*, do apply that to a *Creature* which the *Fathers* did ſuppoſe to belong only to *God*; as if Men *kneel* and *pray* to *Saints*, in the ſame place, at the ſame time, with the ſame Ceremonies of *Devotion* they uſe to *God* himſelf, they take off the *Peculiarity* of this *Worſhip* to *God*, and make it common to his *Creatures*.

*R. P.* This only reaches to the *External Acts*, but the *Intention* and *Deſign* of the *Worſhippers* with us make the Difference.

*P. D.* I do not now meddle with your *Intention* and *Deſign*; but I am purſuing the Force of the Argument uſed by the *Fathers*. To make this yet more plain to you. The *Fathers* uſe the Argument of *External Adoration* againſt the *Arians*; for, ſay they, Peter *forbad* Cornelius *to worſhip him, and the Angel St.* John: From whence they infer, That *God only ought to be worſhipped*; and therefore, *Giving External Adoration to Chriſt, ſuppoſing him to be a Creature, is Idolatry.* Is this Argument good, or not? Defence, p. 165.

*R. P.* Let me conſider a little: *It was good then, but it is not now*: For *T. G.* ſaith, *It is in the Church's Power to determine the Signification of Exterior Signs.*

*P. D.* An admirable Anſwer! Which makes the Arguments of the *Fathers* (in truth) to have no Force at all. For the *Arians* might ſay, the *External Acts* of *Adoration* did not *ſignify* the ſame with them which they did with *Catholicks*; for they only ſignified an *Inferior* and *Relative Worſhip*, when applied to the *Son*; and *Sovereign* and *Abſolute Worſhip*, when given to the *Father*. So that if there be any Force in what the *Fathers* did argue againſt the *Arians*, it will make the *Inferior* and *Relative Worſhip* of a *Creature* to be *Idolatry*; notwithſtanding *Greg. Nyſſen*'s Oration upon *Theodore*.

*R. P.* I am like *T. G.* who hates *a great Book upon one Subject*; ſo do I a long Diſcourſe upon one Argument. Methinks *Greg. Nyſſen* hath taken up a great deal of our Time; and I have ſomething more yet to ſay to you, before we part.

*P. D.* I pray let me hear it; and I ſuppoſe it will admit of a quicker Diſpatch.

*R. P.* It is upon the ſame Head, of the *Doctor's Fidelity in Quoting Authors*; and it concerns the Paſſage in *Arnobius*, in which *T. G.* charged him with *Cogging in the Word* Divinity, *in the Singular Number, inſtead of* Adorable Deities, *in the Plural*: And Dr. *St.* anſwers with a Proteſtation, That he tranſlated theſe Words, *Nihil numinis ineſſe Simulacris*; which, he ſaith, are but Two Lines above the Words *T. G.* charges him with. Dial. p. 252.

*P. D.* And how, I pray, doth *T. G.* clear himſelf? For, in my mind, he is moſt concern'd to vindicate himſelf.

*R. P.* He doth it very well: *For he denies not thoſe Words to be there which D.* St. *tranſlated*; but he ſaith, *He ought not to have tranſlated the*

*Words of* Arnobius *to the Heathens*, *but the Words of the Heathens to* Arnobius; *since his Design was to prove the Heathens did not worship the Images themselves for Gods.*

*P. D.* A pitiful Shift! *T. G.* charged Dr. *St. with Cogging in the Word* Divinty, *in the Singular Number*: Dr. *St.* shews, it was so used but Two Lines before those Words which *T. G.* cites, and those were the Words he translated. Now, saith *T. G. Those were the Words of* Arnobius *to the Heathen.* What then? Doth he not confute them in something which they held? If he proves *Nihil numinis ineſſe ſimulacris*; must not they hold *Aliquid numinis*, &c.? So that it comes all to one. But to put this out of all doubt: If *T. G.* had look'd a little farther, he might have found these very Words of the *Heathens*; *Illud etiam dicere ſimulacrorum aſſertores ſolent*: Surely these are the *Heathens*; *Non ignoraſſe antiquos nihil habere numinis ſigna.* What doth *T. G.* think now? Had he not better look more about him, before he makes such rude and impertinent Clamours about Dr. *St.*'s Insincerity in Quoting Authors? Of which you may judge by this one Instance, where himself is so notoriously faulty: And yet from hence he concludes *what a ſad Account of Citations we are like to have from him.*

Arnob. *l.* 6. *p.* 208.

Dial. p. 257.

*R. P.* What say you to Dr. *St.*'s *Obſervations* of the *Council* of *Trent*, about the *Worſhip* of *Images*?

*P. D.* Have you ever been a *Hunting* of *Squirrels?*

*R. P.* Why do you ask me such an impertinent Question?

*P. D.* Not so impertinent as you think: For the *Squirrel's Leaping* from *Bough* to *Bough*, forwards and backwards, is just like *T. G.*'s Answer to Dr. *St.*'s Book. For he makes nothing of Leaping a Hundred or Two Hundred Pages, forwards and backwards, as the Humour takes him. However, let us hear what he hath to say to those *Obſervations.* For I remember very well, what the Design of them was; *viz.* That though the Worship of *Latria* was owned before it by many *Divines* to be given to *Images*, and that were against the Decree of the *Council* of *Nice*; yet the *Council* of *Trent* allows all External Acts of Adoration of *Images*, gives no Intimation against this kind of Worship; and since it, many of the most eminent *Divines* of your *Church* have justified the giving *Latria* to *Images*, and that from the Words of this Council.

Defence, *p.* 614.

*R. P.* But *T. G.* saith, *those very Divines do not mean by* Latria *proper Divine Worſhip*, *which is due to God and terminated upon him*; *but that the Act being in their Opinion one in Subſtance to the Prototype and the Images*, *it is terminated abſolutely upon the Perſon of Chriſt for himſelf*, *and falls upon the image after an inferior Manner*, *as a thing only relating to him*, *and purely for his ſake*: *for which Reaſon*, *ſome call it relative* Latria; *Others*, *Secundary*; *Others*, *Improper*; *others*, *Analogical*; *others*, per accidens; *and the Diſpute in effect is rather* de modo loquendi, *than of the Thing it ſelf.*

Dial. p. 214.

*P. D.* To clear this Matter, we must consider, (1.) That the *Council* of *Nice* doth deny *Latria* to be given to an *Image.* (2.) That the *Divines* of the *Roman Church* do say that the *Practice* of the *Church* cannot be defended in the *Worſhip* of the *Croſs*, without giving *Latria* to it. (3.) That the *Council* of *Trent*, when just Occasion was given, declares nothing against this; for although it refers to the *Council* of *Nice*, yet when it gives the *Reaſon* of *Worſhip*, it doth it in such Terms, that many of your *Divines* say, must infer the *worſhip* of *Latria* to be given to them.

*R. P.* What

*R. P.* What if it doth, ſaith *T. G.* ſince, *it is only a Diſpute about Words; and all agree, that the Worſhip proper to God, ſignified primarily by the Word* Latria, *is not to be given to Images?*

*P. D.* That muſt be a little better conſidered. For do you think it is poſſible to give the *Worſhip proper* to *God* to an *Image*, or not? If it be not; why did the *Council* of *Nice* declare againſt it? If it be; tell me in what *Acts* that *Worſhip* of *Latria* doth conſiſt?

*R. P.* It is, when Men give *Proper Divine Honour* to an *Image.*

*P. D.* What is this *Proper Divine Honour*? For you are not one Step forwarder by this Anſwer. I ſee I muſt come to Particulars. Were the *Gnoſticks* and Ancient *Hereticks* to blame, in their *Worſhip* of *Images*, or not?

*R. P.* No doubt they were; for they ſtand Condemned by the *Church* for that *Worſhip* they gave to *Images.*

*P. D.* Wherein did their Fault lye?

*R. P. In giving Divine Honour and Worſhip to the Image.*

*P. D.* Did not they *worſhip* the *Image of Chriſt?*

*R. P.* And what then?

*P. D.* Then their Fault lay in Giving *Divine Worſhip* to the *Image of Chriſt*?

*R. P.* Yes, *Proper Divine Worſhip.*

*P. D.* What was that *Proper Divine Worſhip*? Was it *Abſolute*, or *Relative*?

*R. P. Abſolute.*

*P. D.* Then it was Giving *Divine Worſhip to an Image of Chriſt, without reſpect to Chriſt*; which is either *Nonſenſe*, or a *Contradiction.* Is it poſſible to give *Divine Worſhip* to an *Image* of a *Perſon*, without *reſpect* to the Perſon? Men may worſhip a Piece of Wood, or a Stone, without *reſpect* to a Perſon; but to *worſhip that* which *repreſents*, and *on that account*, becauſe it repreſents, without any *reſpect* to *what it repreſents*, is a Contradiction: Therefore the Worſhip of an *Image*, as ſuch, is a *Relative Worſhip*; and *Proper Latria*, as given to an *Image*, is *Relative Latria.*

*R. P.* But Men may give *Abſolute Divine Worſhip to an Image:* For may not a Man join in his Mind the *Image* and *Perſon repreſented*, as one *Object* of *Worſhip*; and ſo give *Proper Divine Worſhip* to both, conſider'd as one?

*P. D.* I thank you for that: For ſo I find ſome of your *Divines* have determined, that in this ſenſe, *Abſolute and Proper Divine Worſhip may be given to the Croſs.* And Dr. *St.* produced ſeveral of them, who contended for an *Abſolute Latria to be due to Images:* Such as *Ludovicus à Paramo*, *Paulus Maria Quarti*, *Gamachæus*, a late *Profeſſor* of *Divinity* in the *Sorbonne*, and others. Defence, p. 616. to p. 620. p. 637.

*R. P.* But *T. G.* ſaith, *They only differ* in modo loquendi.

*P. D.* I think rather *in modo colendi.* For are not *Abſolute* and *Relative Worſhip* Two *diſtinct Kinds*? How elſe comes the giving *Abſolute Worſhip* to be *Idolatry*; and not the giving *Relative?* And if giving Abſolute Worſhip be *Idolatry*, all in your *Church* are guilty of it, who worſhip the *Image* and Thing repreſented, as *One Object.* If it be not, then there can be none to an *Image*, as ſuch.

*R. P.* Yes; *If they offer Sacrifice to Images, as the* Gnoſticks *did.*

*P. D.* S. *Auguſtin* and *Theodoret* ſay, *They adored Images, and offered Incenſe to them.* And is not the very ſame practiſed in your *Church?*

If

If this were *Idolatry* in them, why not in you? Unless your *Church* hath Power to change the *Nature* of *Idolatry*; which is all one with changing the Nature of *Virtues* and *Vices*.

*R. P. But they sacrific'd to Images, as the Heathens did.*

*P. D.* True: For the *burning Incense before Images*, was thought to be *Sacrificing* to them, being joined with *Adoration*. And the *Christians* chose rather to dye, than to join in that Act of Worship towards the *Images* of the *Emperors*: Whence Dr. *St.* observed, that *burning* of *Incense* towards *Images*, was the same Tryal of *Christians*, that Eating of Swines Flesh was of the *Jews*. I pray tell me, Was there any Harm in this, or not? Supposing the *Christians* looked on the *Emperors* as *God's Vicegerents*, and the *Images* only as representing them?

Defence, *p.* 323.

*R. P.* I see what you aim at: You would have me condemn the *Primitive Christians*, or our selves. According to the Sense of the *Church* at that time, it was unlawful; but according to the *Sense* of our *Church* now, it is lawful to do the same Things out of Honour to the *Images* of *Christ*, or his *Saints*.

*P. D.* That is, your *Church* is innocent, if your Church may be Judge. But I now dispute upon your own Principles of *Relative Worship*; whether those *Acts* might not have been done to the *Emperors Images*; which had saved the Lives of so many Martyrs?

*R. P.* No: For the *Emperors* then exacted to be worshipped as *Gods*; *i. e.* with *Divine Worship*.

*P. D.* Was that *Divine Worship Supreme*, or not? *i. e.* Did they take the *Emperors* for *Supreme Deities*?

*R. P.* No: But they gave them *the Worship of the Supreme Deity*.

*P. D.* Then the Giving this *Worship* was thought *Idolatry*; though Mens Conceptions were right, as to their being *Creatures*.

*R. P.* But what is this to the *Worship* of *Images*?

*P. D.* Was it not lawful to give the same *Worship* to the *Images* of the *Emperors*, as to the *Emperors* themselves? Might not they look on the *Emperors* as *God's Vicegerents*; and so give them *Relative Latria* on that Account; and then look on their *Images* as *representing them*; and so give a *Secundary*, *Improper*, *Analogical*, *Relative Latria* to their *Images*? And by this means, the *Heathens* and the *Christians* had only differed *in modo loquendi*; but the *Christians* had saved their Lives by the Bargain.

*R. P.* But our Dispute is, of the *Images* of *Christ*, and not of *Heathen Emperors*.

*P. D.* I only shew the Absurd Consequences of this Doctrine; and how inconsistent it is with the Principles of Primitive Christianity. But I return to the Distinctions of your *Divines*, about *Latria* being given to *Images*. You all agree, *T. G.* saith, *That the Worship proper to God, is not to be given to Images.* Is not *Latria* the *Worship* proper to God?

*R. P.* Yes: *Proper Latria* is; but not *Improper and Relative*

*P. D.* Is there any Worship so *proper* to *God*, that it cannot be *improperly* and *relatively* given to an Image?

*R. P.* What do you mean? For I do not understand you.

*P. D.* Rather, you will not. I ask you, Whether there be any such *Act* of *Worship* so *proper* to God, that you may not in *respect* to God, do that to his *Image*; or, in *respect* to *Christ*, do that to the *Cross*?

*R. P.* Al-

*R. P.* Although there may be none ſuch, yet the *Church* doth not uſe all *Acts* of *Worſhip* to the *Image*, which it doth to God.

*P. D.* I do not ask what you do; but what upon your *Principles* you may do. And ſuppoſe a Man doth that Act which your *Church* allows not, is he Guilty of *Idolatry*, or *bare Diſobedience*, in doing it to an *Image*?

*R. P.* Of *Idolatry*.

*P. D.* Then there are ſuch external *Acts* of *Worſhip* ſo *proper* to *God* himſelf, that the doing them to an *Image* for *his ſake* is *Idolatry*. As to *ſacrifice* to an *Image* for the *ſake* of *Chriſt* is *Idolatry*. Is it not?

*R. P.* Yes.

*P. D.* Is the *improper* and *relative Sacrificing* to an *Image Idolatry*?

*R. P.* You ask an untoward Queſtion. For I ſee what you drive at.

*P. D.* Anſwer me directly. Is it, or is it not?

*R. P.* I think it is.

*P. D.* Then it follows, that this Diſtinction of *Proper* and *Improper*, *Abſolute* and *Relative Latria*, ſignifies nothing. For if the *Acts* of *Worſhip* are *proper* to *God*, no *relative* or *improper Uſe* of them can excuſe from *Idolatry*; if they are not proper, then it is no *Latria*.

*R. P.* I muſt think again of this Matter. For as you repreſent it, this can never excuſe us.

*P. D.* I wonder ſo many ſubtle Men ſhould ever think it would. But I will not thus give it over. When the *Council* of *Nice* did forbid *Latria* being given to an Image, did they mean to an *Image*, as a piece of Wood, or Stone; or to an *Image*, *as an Image*?

*R. P. As an Image.* For they did forbid giving *Latria* to that which they *worſhipped*; but they *worſhipped* it as *an Image*, for the *ſake of the Prototype*.

*P. D.* Your Reaſon is unanſwerable. Therefore I ſay, they did forbid all *relative Latria* of an *Image*, call it by what Name ſoever you pleaſe. For the *Worſhip* of an *Image as ſuch* muſt be *relative Worſhip*. Therefore all thoſe who contend for *relative Latria* are condemned by the *Council* of *Nice*. Beſides, I would fain know of theſe Gentlemen, whether their *improper* and *relative Latria*, be *Latria* or *Inferior Worſhip*? one or other it muſt be; and it is a Contradiction to ſay *Latria* is *inferior Worſhip*; for that is to ſay, It is *Latria*, and it is not. If it be then *true Latria*, I ask whether the *Image as an Image* be *God* or a *Creature*; if it be a *Creature*, as no doubt it is, then *true Latria* is given to a *Creature*; which according to *T. G.* muſt be *Idolatry*. Again; Either it is the ſame *Act* of *Latria* which is terminated on the *Perſon of Chriſt abſolutely*, and on the *Croſs relatively*; or it is a *different Act*. If the *ſame Act*; then there is a double *Worſhip*, and but one *Act*; for there is an *abſolute Worſhip* of the *Perſon* of *Chriſt*, and a *relative Worſhip* of the *Image*; and let it be *relative*, or what it will, it is a *real Act* of *Worſhip*; and ſo there muſt be two Acts, and yet it is but one Act. For is the *Image* or *Croſs* worſhipped, or not? If it be worſhipped, there muſt be an *Act* of *Worſhip terminated* on it; and how can there be an *Act* of Worſhip terminated upon it, if the ſame Act paſſeth from the *Image* to the *Prototype*? Theſe are unintelligible Subtilties, and only invented to confound Men's Underſtandings, as to the true and diſtinct *Notion* of *Divine Worſhip*; and to blind their Minds in the Practice of *Idolatry*. Farther, if this be a difference only *de modo loquendi*, as *T. G.* ſaith, then the very *ſame Act* may be *proper* and *improper*, *abſolute* and *relative*, *per ſe* and *per accidens*. For

ſo

so *T. G.* saith, *that it is one Act in Substance: but it is absolute, as terminated on the Person of Christ, relative, as on the Cross.* Proper in one sense, improper in the other; *per se* in the former sense, *per accidens* in the latter. Which *Catharinus* thought to be no less than *ridiculous*. Lastly, There is nothing in the World but may be worshipped with *Latria*, by the Help of these Distinctions. For a *Divine Presence* in the *Creatures*, is really a far better Ground of Worship, than a bare *Fiction* of the Mind, that the Image and the Thing represented are all one. But of this we have discoursed already.

*R. P.* To tell you plainly my Mind, I never liked this giving *Latria to Images* my self; but it being a common Doctrine in our *Church*, we ought to say as much for it as we can: But I am only for an *Inferior Worship to be given to them*; and so is *T. G.* if I do not much mistake his Meaning.

*P. D.* Let us then consider this *Inferior Worship*, as distinct from *Latria*: And concerning this I shall prove, That it neither answers the *Reasons* given by *Councils*, nor the *Practice* of the *Roman Church*.

(1.) Not the *Reasons* given by the *Councils* of *Nice* and *Trent*. For which I desire but these Two *Postulata*. 1. That *Images* are to have *True* and *Proper Worship* given to them; which is expressly determined by those *Councils*. 2. That the *Reason* of this *Worship is nothing inherent in the Image, but something represented by it*. Which is affirmed by those *Councils*. From hence I argue thus:

To worship Christ only before an Image, is not to give *Proper Worship to the Image*, which the *Councils* require to be given. Therefore, either the *Image* is to be *worshipped for it self*, which were *Idolatry*, by your own Confession; or Christ is to be worshipped in and by the *Image*.

*R. P. Christ is to be worshipped in and by the Image.*

*P. D.* Then do you give *Christ* the *Worship due to him*, or not?

*R. P. The Worship due to him.*

*P. D.* But the *Worship due to Christ* is *Proper Latria*; therefore you must give *Proper Latria to Christ*, *as worshipped in and by the Image*.

*R. P.* True: But we give it to the *Image of Christ*, otherwise than to his *Person*; for we worship him *absolutely*, and the *Image respectively* and *for his sake*.

*P. D.* That is it which I would have; That there is no *worshipping* an *Image* on the account of *Representation*, but you must fall into the Doctrine of *Relative Latria*.

*R. P.* But may not I shew Respect to the *Cross* for *Christ's sake*, without giving the same *Worship* to the *Cross* that I do to Christ?

*P. D.* That is not the Question: But, Whether you may *worship Christ*, in and by the *Cross representing* his *Person*, without giving that *Worship* which belongs to the *Person* of *Christ*? For either you worship the *Cross* for *it self*, which you confess to be *Idolatry*; or you *worship Christ as represented by it*: If you worship Christ, you must give him the *Worship* which belongs to him; and that can be no other than *Latria*. Which not only appears by the *Doctrine*, but by the *Practice* of your *Church*, in the *Worship* of the *Cross*. Which I prove by the Second *Particular*; viz.

(2.) *Inferior Worship* doth not come up to the *Practice* of your *Church*; because your *Church*, in Praying to the *Cross*, speaks to it, as if it were

Christ

Chriſt himſelf. *O Crux ave, ſpes unica*, &c. as *Aquinas* obſerves, and many other of your *Divines*, who never own any *Proſopopœia*; but do ſay, *That the Croſs is truly worſhipped with that Worſhip which belongs to the Perſon of Chriſt, on the account of Repreſentation.* And can you imagine ſo many of your moſt Eminent *Divines* would have put themſelves to ſo much difficulty in defending a *Relative Latria*, if they could have defended the *Practice* of your *Church* without it? But they ſaw plainly the *Church* did own ſuch a *Worſhip* to the *Croſs*; and when Occaſion was offered, did declare it; as in the Place cited out of the *Pontifical* by Dr. *St.*; which it would never have done, if it had not been agreeable to its ſenſe. Defence, p. 640.

*R. P.* But this is but *one ſingle Paſſage*; and will you condemn a whole *Church* for that?

*P. D.* Not, if the Senſe of the *Church* were otherwiſe fully expreſſed againſt it: But here we have ſhewed that Paſſage to be very agreeable to the Reaſon of *Worſhip*, given by your *Councils*; and to the *Solemn Practice* of your *Church* in *Adoration* of the *Croſs*; and therefore that Paſſage ought to be look'd on, as a more explicit Declaration of the Senſe of the Church. For, let me ask you, if the *Church* of *Rome* had been againſt *Latria* being given to the *Croſs*, Whether, in a Book of ſuch publick and conſtant *Uſe* as the *Pontifical* is, it ſhould be left ſtanding; when the *Book-Menders* are ſo buſie in your *Church*, that ſcarce an *Index* of a *Father* can eſcape them, nor ſuch Sentences as ſeem to thwart their preſent Doctrine. Of which take this Inſtance. You remember what ſtir *T. G.* made about *Gregory Nyſſen's Oration* upon *Theodore*: Now the ſame Perſon diſputing againſt the *Arians*, ſaith, *That no Created Thing is to be worſhipped by Men.* This Sentence, *Antonius*, in his *Meliſſa*, had put down thus; *That we are only to worſhip that Being which is Uncreated.* This Book happen'd to come under the *Spaniſh Index* of *Cardinal Quiroga*; Do you think he would ſuffer it to ſtand as it did? No, I aſſure you; *Deleatur dictio ſolummodo*, ſaith he; *ſatis pro Imperio*: Away with this *Only.* Why ſo? Was it not in the Author? No matter for that: It is againſt the *Practice* of the *Church*; Out with it. More ſuch Inſtances might be produced; but I appeal to your ſelf, Whether after ſuch Care hath been taken to review the *Pontifical* by *Clement* VIII. and the Publiſhing of it with ſo much *Authority*, ſuch a Paſſage would have been ſuffered to remain, if it had been any ways repugnant to the Senſe of the *Church*?

*R. P.* But *T. G.* ſaith, *The Terms of Communion with the Church, are not the Opinions of her School-Divines, but the Decrees of her Councils.* Dial. p. 263.

*P. D.* And what then? Did Dr. *St.* meddle with the *School-Divines*, any otherwiſe than as they explained the *Senſe* of *Councils*, or the *Practice* of the *Church*? And what Helps more proper to underſtand theſe, than the *Doctrine* of your moſt Learned *Divines*? *T. G.* will have one Mr. *Thorndike* to ſpeak the *Senſe* of the *Church* of *England*, againſt the Current Doctrine of the reſt; as Dr. *St.* hath proved; yet he will not allow ſo many *Divines* of greateſt Note and Authority, to explain the *Senſe* of the *Church* of *Rome*? Is this equal Dealing?

*R. P. T. G.* ſaith, *That for his Life he cannot underſtand any more the Idolatry of worſhipping an Image, than the Treaſon of Bowing to a Chair of State, or the Adultery of a Wife's Kiſſing her Husband's Picture; and that the ſame Subtilties may be uſed againſt theſe, as againſt the other:* Dial. p. 264.

*And therefore, notwithſtanding the Diſputes of School-Divines, honeſt Nature, informed with Chriſtian Principles, will be Security enough againſt the Practice of Idolatry, in Honouring the Image of Chriſt for his ſake.*

*P. D.* What is the matter with *T. G. that for his Life he can underſtand theſe Things no better*, after all the Pains which hath been taken about him? Hath not the Difference of theſe Caſes been laid open before him? Do not your own Writers confeſs, *That in ſome Caſes an Image may become an Idol, by having Divine Worſhip given to it*? Is this then the ſame Caſe, with *a Wife's Kiſſing her Husband's Picture*? Doth not this excuſe the *Gnoſticks Worſhip* of the *Image* of *Chriſt*, as well as *yours*? If there may be *Idolatry* in the *Worſhip* of an *Image*, we are then to conſider, Whether your *Worſhip* be not *Idolatry*? Eſpecially, ſince both Parties charge each other with *Idolatry*; thoſe who will have it to be *Latria*, and thoſe who will not. And I do not ſee what Honeſt Nature can do in this Caſe, however aſſiſted; unleſs it can make the *Worſhip* of *Images* to be neither one nor the other. I ſee *T.G.* would fain make it to be no more than *bare Honour of an Image, for the ſake of Chriſt*: But this doth not come up to the *Decrees* of *Councils*, the General *Senſe* of *Divines*, and the *Conſtant Practice* of your *Church*. If ever *Worſhip* was given to *Images*, you give it; by uſing all *Acts* of *Adoration* towards them.

*R. P. But ſuppoſe the King had made an Order, That due Honour and Reſpect ſhould be given to the Chair of State; ought not that to be obſerved, notwithſtanding the Diſputes which might ariſe about the Nature of the Act?*

*P. D.* To anſwer this, we muſt ſuppoſe a *Command* from *God*, that we muſt *worſhip* an *Image* of *Chriſt*, as we do his *Perſon*; but here it is juſt contrary; the *Reaſon* of the Second *Command* being owned by the *Chriſtian Church* to hold againſt the *Worſhip* of *Images* now, as well as under the *Law*. But thoſe in the *Church* of *Rome*, who do charge each other with *Idolatry*, without ſuppoſing any ſuch Command, do proceed upon the *Nature* of the *Worſhip*; which muſt either be *Divine Worſhip*, (which one Party ſaith is *Idolatry*, being the ſame which is given to *God*) or an inferior *Religious Worſhip*, which the other Party ſaith muſt be *Idolatry*; being an *Expreſſion of our Submiſſion to an Inanimate Thing*. And, *for my Life*, I cannot ſee what Anſwer *T. G.* makes to his.

Dial. p. 265. *R. P. T. G.* ſaith, *The Rules of the Church are to be obſerved in this Caſe, as the Rules of the Court about the Chair of State.*

*P. D.* What! Are the *Rules* of the *Church* to be obſerved *abſolutely*, whether againſt the *Law* of *God*, or not? Which is as much as to ſay at *Court*, That the *Orders* of the *Green-Cloth* are to be obſerved, againſt his *Majeſty's Pleaſure*. But not to inſiſt on that; I ſay, in this Caſe, the *Rules* of the *Church* help nothing: For they who do follow the *Rules* of the *Church*, muſt do one or the other of theſe; and which ſoever they do, they are charged with *Idolatry*. And therefore Dr. *St.* had great Reaſon to ſay; Where there is no Neceſſity of doing the thing, the beſt way to avoid *Idolatry*, is, to give no *Worſhip* to *Images* at all.

Dial. p. 266. *R. P. What will become of the Rules of the Church*, ſaith *T. G. if Men may be permitted to break them for ſuch Capriches as theſe are?*

*P. D.* Are

*P. D.* Are you in earneſt? Doth *T. G.* call theſe *Capriches? Idolatry* is accounted both by *Fathers* and *Schoolmen* a *Crime* of the *higheſt Nature*; and when I am told I muſt commit it one way or other, by your *Divines*, if I give *Worſhip* to *Images*, is this only a *Capriche*?

*R. P. Will not the ſame Reaſon hold againſt Bowing to the Altar; Bowing being an Act of Worſhip appropriated to God?* Dial. p. 267.

*P. D.* Will the ſame Reaſon hold againſt *Bowing* out of *Reverence to Almighty God*? Which I have told you again and again, is all our *Church* allows in that which you call *Bowing to the Altar.* I ſee you are very hard put to it, to bring in this ſingle *Inſtance* upon every turn, againſt the plain Senſe and Declaration of our *Church.* If this be all *T. G.* upon ſo long Conſideration, hath to ſay in this matter; it is not hard to judge, who hath much the better Cauſe.

*R. P.* I pray, hold from *Triumphing* a while; for there is a freſh Charge behind; wherein you will repent that ever you undertook to defend Dr. *St.*: It is, concerning the *Unjuſt Parallel* he hath made between the *Heathen and Romiſh Idolatry.*

*P. D.* I ſee no Cauſe to repent hitherto; and I hope I ſhall find as little when I come to that.

THE

# Fourth Conference,

## *About the Parallel between the* Heathen *and* Romiſh IDOLATRY.

*R. P.* HAVE you conſidered what *T. G.* ſaith, concerning *the Parallel between the Heathen and* Romiſh *Idolatry*? And doth not your Heart fail you, as to the Defence of Dr. *St.* which you promiſed to undertake?

*P. D.* No, truly. The more I have conſider'd it, the leſs I fear it.

*R. P.* What think you of the Notion of *Idolatry*, he chargeth on *T. G.*? Viz. *That it is the giving the Sovereign Worſhip of God to a Creature; and among the Heathens, to the Devil; as if the Idolatry of the Heathens conſiſted only in worſhipping the Devil: Whereas, it appears from the Words Dr.* St. *cites out of him, that he charged the Heathens with Idolatry, in worſhipping their Images for Gods, and the Creatures for Gods; although withal they worſhipped Evil Spirits*; and *T. G.* contends, *that their Supreme God was an Arch-Devil.*

Dial. p. 276.

*P. D.* Is this ſuch a Difficulty to be ſet in the Front? I ſuppoſe, it is only to try whether I will ſtumble at the Threſhold. If the *Supreme God* whom the Heathens worſhipped, was an *Arch-Devil*, as *T. G.* ſaith; then, without all Queſtion, they gave their moſt *Sovereign Worſhip* to the *Devil.* And when he pleads ſo earneſtly, That all the *Gods* of the *Heathens* were *Devils*, under whatſoever Name or Title they worſhipped them; what Injury can *T. G.* think it to his *Hypotheſis*, to ſay, That the *Heathen Idolatry* did conſiſt in giving *Sovereign Worſhip to the Devil?* Beſides, Dr. *St.*'s Words do not imply, That according to *T. G.* the Heathens did not give *Sovereign Worſhip* to other Things; but that they did it *eminently* to the *Devil:* Which muſt needs follow, if the *Supreme God* among them was no other than an *Arch-Devil*; as *T. G.* then aſſerted, and now endeavours more at large to prove.

*R. P.* Therefore waving this, I come to the main Point; *Whether the Heathen* Jupiter *were the true God, or an Arch-Devil?*

*P. D.* You are juſt like the Author of a late Scurrilous Pamphlet called *Jupiter, Dr.* St.*'s Supreme God*, &c. who would fain reduce the whole Queſtion of *Idolatry* to this ſingle Point, without conſidering either the Occaſion of this Queſtion, or the main Arguments uſed by Dr. *St.*, or the very ſcope and deſign of his Diſcourſe: But he is ſo pitiful a Trifler, that he deſerves no Notice at all. That we may proceed more clearly in this Debate, we ought firſt to attend to the principal Queſtion; which was, whether *Idolatry* be conſiſtent with the Acknowledgment of one Supreme Being? And the Reaſon of this

Queſtion

Queſtion was, becauſe thoſe who did plead the moſt plauſibly in excuſing your *Church* from *Idolatry*, went upon this Principle, that ſuppoſing Men preſerved in their Minds the Notion of one Supreme Being, it is impoſſible they ſhould give to a Creature that Honour which was due to God alone. To overthrow this Dr. *St.* undertook to ſhew, that this Principle would equally excuſe the Heathen Idolatry, ſince both the ancient and modern Heathens did own one *Supreme God*. And if this be granted him, it matters not to the main deſign of his Diſcourſe whether it were *Jupiter* or not. And it is a wonder to me, ſince the Man in *T. G.*'s *Dialogues* who argues againſt Dr. *St.* profeſſes himſelf a *Diſciple* of Mr. *Thorndike*, he ſhould never take notice of this Principle, nor once go about to defend it. But ſince *T. G.* acknowledges *that the Heathens had a Notion of One Supreme Being ingrafted in their Minds by Nature*; the Point then in debate is, on what account they were charged with *Idolatry*; and whether that will not reach to the *Practices* of the *Roman Church*, *i. e.* whether their *Idolatry* lay in *worſhipping* the *Creature* and *not the Creator*; or in giving *Divine Worſhip*, though of *different Degrees*, to the *Creature* and the *Creator*? And here lies the main Strength of this Controverſy; and ſuppoſing Dr. *St.* were miſtaken as to the Senſe of the *Fathers*, about *Jupiter*; yet if the true Notion of *Idolatry* be proved to conſiſt in giving the ſame Divine Worſhip to *God* and his *Creatures*, his Parallel will be ſufficient to make good the Charge of *Idolatry* againſt the *Church* of *Rome*. Yet, ſince *T. G.* ſeems to lay ſo much weight upon the *Fathers Senſe* concerning *Jupiter*, I am content to examine them together with you; but in the firſt place let us conſider, what the *Scripture* ſaith to this Point; for as I remember Dr. *St.* began with that, then he proceeded to your own *Writers*; and at laſt brought in the *Teſtimonies* of Fathers; and I ſee no Reaſon we ſhould go off from this method. Dial. p. 371.

*R. P.* Since you will have it ſo, I will begin with the Scripture; and Dr. *St.* pretends to prove *Jupiter* to be the *Supreme God*, from thoſe words *Acts* 17. *Whom ye ignorantly worſhip, him I declare unto you.*

*P. D.* Conſider, I pray, the Queſtion between Dr. *St.* and *T. G.*, *viz.* whether it were the *true God*, or an *Arch-devil*: And Dr. *St.* argues in theſe Words. "Did St. *Paul* mean the *Devil* when he ſaid, *whom you* "*ignorantly worſhip, him I declare unto you*? Did he in good earneſt go "abroad to preach the Devil to the World? Yet he preached him whom "they ignorantly worſhipped. What ſaith *T. G.* to this?

*R. P.* From this very Inſcription, *To the unknown God*, he notably proves, *it could not be underſtood of* Jupiter, *who was a known God*; *and St.* Paul *could not be ſaid to come to preach their* Jupiter *to the* Athenians, *when he expreſly tells them, he came to declare to them a God whom they did not know.* Dial. p. 301.

*P. D.* To this I anſwer, that the *Athenians* had ſo confounded the Notion of the *Supreme God*, with that of the *Poetical Jupiter*; and the Peoples Fancies were ſo ſtained and polluted with thoſe vulgar Repreſentations of *Jove*, which they learnt from the *Poets* and *Painters*, that the *Apoſtle* rather choſe to preach the *true God* to them from the Inſcription to the *unknown God*, than from any Altars that were inſcribed *Jovi Opt. Max.* Becauſe the *People* would have imagined, if St. *Paul* had made choice of any uſual Inſcription to a *Deity* worſhipped in common with the reſt, that he muſt in conſequence allow the *Nature* and *Kind* of their *Worſhip*. For they joyned *Jupiter* and the reſt of their *Gods* together,

ther, the *Body* of their *Worſhip* conſiſting of an Acknowledgment of one as *Supreme*, viz. *Jupiter*, and of the reſt as worſhipped together with him; and ſo their Worſhip being a *complex* thing, it was more agreeable to the Apoſtles deſign, which was to deſtroy their *Idolatry*, not to make uſe of that Notion of *God* which was corrupted by their *Idolatries*, but to take Advantage from the *Inſcription* to *the unknown God*, ſo to declare his *Nature*, as to confute their Idolatrous Worſhip, as he doth in the following Verſes. *Jupiter* therefore as he was the *Head* of the *Heathen Worſhip*, and as he ſtood in *Conjunction* with their other *Deities*, was a *known God* amongſt them, and ſolemnly worſhipped by the *Athenians*; but as by *Jove* was underſtood the *Eternal Mind* as the *only proper Object* of *Divine Worſhip*, and therefore ought not to be worſhipped with Men's Hands, nor to be joined with his *Creatures*, ſo he was an *unknown God*. For they had no other Knowledge of a *Supreme God*, than as of one who admitted others into a *Participation* of the ſame *Worſhip* with himſelf. And there were theſe two Things which made thoſe *Gentiles* diſown the *God* of the *Jews*, who agreed with them in the Acknowledgment of *One Supreme God* who made the World, (1.) That he would be worſhipped by no *Images* or *Repreſentations* of himſelf. (2.) That he would admit no *inferior Beings* to have any Share in *Divine Worſhip*, but all ſuch were accounted *Idolaters* by the *Jewiſh Laws*, who according to the Eaſtern Cuſtoms worſhipped any other as *Mediators*, or *inferior Deities*. From hence the Heathens accounted the *God* of the *Jews* an *unknown* and *unſociable Deity*; there being no Repreſentations made of him; nor any others to be joyned in worſhip with him: Therefore *Dion Caſſius* calls him Ἄῤῥητον καὶ ἀειδῆ, *a God who could neither be deſcribed nor repreſented*. If we believe *Georgius Syncellus*, this *Altar* and *Inſcription*, *To the Unknown God*, was but lately ſet up at *Athens*; whence St. *Paul* might have the greater Reaſon to take notice of it, and from thence to declare how unſuitable their *Worſhip* was to the *true God*. And therefore St. *Paul* when he ſuppoſes the *True God* to be the *unknown God* among them, ſpeaks not in reſpect of his *Eternal Being*, for even *T. G.* confeſſeth *the Heathens had the Notion of one Supreme God ingrafted in their Minds by Nature*; but in reſpect of his *way* of *Worſhip*, without *Images* or *Inferior Deities*. For ſo he purſues his Diſcourſe, by arguing from his *Perfections*, againſt that way of *Worſhip* which was in uſe among them. Whereas, if he had ſuppoſed them wholly ignorant of *One Supreme God*, his firſt and moſt neceſſary Work had been to have proved there was ſuch a *One*; but this he ſuppoſes as a thing well enough known in *General* by them; but not *worſhipped* by them as he ought to be. *God that made the World and all Things therein, ſeeing that he is Lord of Heaven and Earth, dwelleth not in Temples made with hands; nor is worſhipped with Men's Hands*, &c. If St. *Paul* had ſuppoſed them ignorant of a *Supreme God*, ought he not firſt to have proved that there was *a God who made the world*, &c. But ſince there was no Diſpute about that, he ſhews the *incongruity* of their *way* of *Worſhip* to the *Perfections* of his *Nature*. St. *Auguſtin* proves from this place, *Whom ye ignorantly worſhip, him I declare unto you*; that the *True God* was *truly* though *ignorantly worſhipped* by the *Athenians*. *For*, ſaith he, *what did St.* Paul *preach to them, but that the ſame God whom they ignorantly and unprofitably worſhipped out of the Church, they ſhould worſhip wiſely and ſavingly in the Church? One God*, ſaith he, *is worſhipped ignorantly without the Church, and yet he is the ſame God: as it is the ſame Faith which is without Charity out of the Church;*

Syn. Chron. p. 333.

Aug. c. Creſc. l. 1. c. 28, 29.

*for*

*for it is One God, and One Faith, and One Catholick Church* ; Non in quâ ſolâ unus Deus colitur, ſed in quâ ſolâ unus Deus piè colitur. *Not in which alone One God is worſhipped ; but in which alone One God is piouſly worſhipped.* The fault then of the *Athenians* lay in their manner of the *Worſhip* of the *True God*, and not in the *total neglect* of it, or in worſhipping an *Arch-devil* inſtead of him.

*R. P. T. G.* doth not deny *that they had ſome confuſed Notion of a Supreme God*, but he ſaith, *that he whom they worſhipped under the Notion of* Jupiter *was an Arch-devil.*

*P. D.* It appears by S. *Auguſtin*, that they worſhipped the *ſame God*, while they were *Heathens*, and when they became *Chriſtians*, but after a *different manner.* And as to *Jupiter*, Dr. *St.* obſerves, that S. *Paul* quotes the Saying of *Aratus*, *For we are his Off-ſpring* ; which words are ſpoken of *Jupiter* by the *Poet*, and applied to the *True God* by the *Apoſtle* ; and ſurely he did not mean that *we are the Devil's Off-ſpring* ; but from thence he infers, that we are the *Off-ſpring of God* ; So that if S. *Paul* may be credited rather than *T. G.* their *Jupiter* was ſo far from being the *Arch-devil*, that he was the *true God bleſſed for evermore.*

*R. P.* To this *T. G.* anſwers, *that it is no wonder a Heathen Poet ſhould apply the Attributes of the true God to* Jupiter ; *and the Name of* Jupiter *to the true God, as being the Name of that Deity which was Supreme among them ; but S.* Paul *takes the Poets words by way of Abſtraction from* Jupiter, *and applies them to the true God ; leaving out all mention of* Jupiter, *and changing his Name ; which he would not have done if their* Jupiter *was the true God.*

*P. D.* I pray tell me one thing ; did S. *Paul* only intend to fill up his Diſcourſe with the *end* of a *Verſe*, as ſome Writers do, with *Omne tulit punctum, &c.* or did he intend it by way of Argument to convince the *Athenians* ?

*R. P.* S. *Paul* ſurely did not affect *Pedantry*, and therefore it muſt be Argumentative.

*P. D.* If that be granted, conſider the force of the Argument in *T. G.*'s Senſe of S. *Paul*'s Words. *For in him we live, and move, and have our Being ; as certain alſo of your own Poets have ſaid, For we are alſo his Off-ſpring. For as much then as we are the Off-ſpring of God*, &c. S. *Paul* proves that we have our Life, Motion, and Subſiſtence from God, from the Words of *Aratus* ; *For we are his Off-ſpring.* Either *Aratus* did ſpeak of the *ſame God* whom S. *Paul* ſpeaks of, or not ? if not, where lies the force of the Argument ? if he did, then S. *Paul* allows *Aratus* his *Jupiter* to be the *Supreme God.* Whoſoever reads the *Verſes* in *Aratus*, cannot imagine he ſhould mean any elſe ; and the *Greek Scholiaſt* there ſaith, *by Jupiter he meant the God that made the World.* And Dr. *St.* produced the Teſtimony of *Ariſtobulus* the *Jewiſh Philoſopher*, to the ſame purpoſe, viz. *that under the Name of* Jove, *his deſign was to expreſs the true God.*

*R. P.* T. G. *doth not deny that* Aratus *might apply the Name of* Jupiter *to the true God, and the Attributes of the true God to* Jupiter : *But*, he ſaith, *it doth not follow that S.* Paul, *becauſe he cited him, thought their* Jupiter *to be the true God.* Dial. p. 303.

*P. D.* Suppoſe then S. *Paul* was of *T. G.*'s mind, and that their *Jupiter* was an *Arch-devil* ; and ſee what admirable reaſoning he attributes to S. *Paul.* We have all our Dependance upon God, as certain of your own Poets have ſaid, ſpeaking of him who was really *an Arch-devil* ;

*For*

*For we are his off-spring.* If an *Athenian* had asked S. *Paul*, whose Off-spring doth *Aratus* say we are? *God's* or the *Devils?* If *Jove* meant by *Aratus* was no other than an *Arch-devil*, how doth this prove us to have our Dependance on *God* for Life and Motion? If he were the *true God*, then I grant it follows; and the *Jupiter* meant by *Aratus* must be the *Supreme God.* If *Aratus* doth give the Name of *Jupiter* to the *true God*; then he that was meant under that Name was the *true God*; and S. *Paul* bringing this Sentence to prove a main point of *Divinity*, must allow him that was called by the Name of *Jupiter* to have been the *true God.* And if *T. G.* doth yield that the *Poet* did apply the Name of *Jupiter* to the *true God*, he gives up the Cause, for that is all which Dr. *St.* contends for: And surely it is not possible for *T. G.* to imagine the *true God* and an *Arch-devil* to be the same. And supposing that Dr. *St. had such a*

P. 302. *Faculty as he mentions, of changing the Devil himself into God*; it seems much more desirable, than that of *T. G.* of changing the *true God* into an *Arch-devil.*

*R. P. But doth not S.* Paul *say, that the Heathens offered to Devils and not to God; and will you make S.* Paul *to contradict himself?*

P. 304. *P. D. S. Paul* doth not there speak of their *Intention* and *Design*; for they professed to worship the *true God*, and *good Spirits* as *inferior Deities*; but what their Worship was in God's account; which being so abominably corrupted with *Idolatry* and *Superstition*, was so far from being pleasing to God, that it could be acceptable to none but impure Spirits. From whence you may do well to observe, that Worship is not terminated according to the *Intention* of the *Persons*, but according to the *Nature* and *Design* of the *Worship*; For the *Heathens*, when they were urged, did stifly maintain, *that the Spirits they worshipped, were good in themselves*

Defence, *and kind to us*, and utterly denied that they worshipped any other; as
P. 518. Dr. *St.* hath shewed; but notwithstanding this, S. *Paul* doth charge them with *the worshipping of Devils and not of God.* And the main Argument the Fathers had to prove them to be *evil Spirits*, was because they received such Worship from Men, which good Spirits would never have done. This Observation is of necessary use for understanding both *Scripture* and *Fathers*, when they charge the Heathen Idolaters with *worshipping Devils and not God*; as will appear by our following Discourse. This place doth not therefore prove that the *Gentiles* did not *intend* to worship *the true God* under the Title of *Jupiter O. M.* but that Idolatrous Worship doth not tend to the *Honour* of *God*, but to the *service* of the *Devil.*

*R. P. Do not you remember, when at* Lystra *the Priest of* Jupiter *would*

Page 304, *have offered Sacrifice to St.* Paul *as* Mercury, *and to* Barnabas *as* Jove,
305. *in whose Shapes they supposed those Gods to have appeared*; *St.* Paul *not only forbad them to do it, but told them, their Design was to convert them from those vain Things to the Living God. And can you now think that St.* Paul *meant* Jupiter *by this Living God; when he taught them to convert themselves from those vain Things (their False Gods) to the Living God*; i. e. *to* Jupiter? *Was this his way to perswade the Men of* Lystra *to leave the Worship of their Gods, to tell them that he came to teach them to worship* Jupiter?

*P. D.* Is there no Difference between these Two Questions? Whether the *True God* might not be worshipped among the *Heathens*, under the Title of *Jupiter O. M.*? And whether *Jupiter* of *Crete*, as worshipped by them, was not a *False God*? This latter Dr. *St.* never denied;

and

and the former was all he pleaded for, as pertinent to his Purpose. When they did make such a Description of him, as to his *Power* and *Goodness*, as could not agree to such a Wretch as the *Cretan Jupiter* was described by the Poets; when they rejected the *Poetical Fables*, and declared as plainly as Men could do, that they understood *the Supreme Governor of the World*; as Dr. *St.* hath at large shewed; the Question is, Whether, under the Name of *Jove*, they meant the *True God*, or not? But doth he ever so much as intimate, that *Jupiter* of *Crete* was not a *False God?* Or, that S. *Paul*, and the *Apostles*, did not go about to convert Mankind from the *Vanities* of *Idol-Worship*, in the Sacrifices they made to this *Jupiter* and *Mercury*, as well as any other of their Inferior Deities? To make this Matter more clear, which concerns the Worship of *Jupiter* among the *Heathens*, we are to observe, Defence, p. 44, &c.

1. That the Name was more ancient in *Greece* for an Object of Divine Worship, than *Jupiter* of *Crete*. If this can be made out, then although this Name might be applied to a particular Person, (as it was usual in the *Eastern* Parts, to call their Princes by the Name of their Gods) yet originally it belonged to the *Deity*, and consequently might still be properly attributed to him; and under that Name they might well understand the Supreme God. For the proof of this, I make use of an Observation of *Pausanias*, and of others from him; viz. *That* Cecrops *was the first who called the Supreme God* Δία, or *Jove*: *Eusebius* hath it Ζῆνα. *Hic primus omnium Jovem appellavit*, saith *Isidore*. It is well known, that *Cecrops* came out of *Egypt*; from whence *Herodotus* observes, the *Greeks* took the Names of their *Gods*: *Cecrops* lived in the time of *Moses*, and before the Flood of *Deucalion*, saith *Varro*. It happen'd in his time, say *Eusebius* and S. *Jerom*, in which great part of *Thessaly* and *Greece* were overwhelmed. But *Jupiter* of *Crete*, by whom *Europa* the Daughter of *Agenor* was taken, was the Fifth in Descent from *Deucalion*, according to *Diodorus*; being the Son of *Tectamus*, the Son of *Dorus*, the Son of *Hellen*, the Son of *Deucalion*. His proper Name, *Diodorus* saith, was *Asterius*; whom *Eusebius* follows. S. *Augustin* calls him *Zanthus*; and *Strabo*, *Zathus*; whose Son *Ion* carried the Colonies of *Greeks* into the Twelve Cities of *Asia*, from him called *Ionia*. From hence it appears, that the Name of *Jupiter* did not properly belong to him of *Crete*, but was assumed by him, when he affected *Divine Honours*. Pausan. in Arcad. Euseb. Chron. p. 28. Isid. Orig. l. 8. Aug. de Civ. Dei, l. 18. c. 10.

2. This *Jupiter* of *Crete* did obtain *Divine Honour*, under that Name, among the rude and barbarous *Greeks*. And this was the great Discovery made by *Euhemerus*, from the Inscription in the Temple of *Jupiter Triphylius*, in *Greece*: From whence it appeared, that this *King* of *Crete* was a very busy and active Prince, having great Command both at Sea and Land; and was very successful in Reducing the Barbarous People under Laws and Government, and in many useful Inventions for the Benefit of Human Life: Which made the People after his Death in *Crete*, bestow the greatest Divine Honours upon him, and worship him under the most Sacred Name. For it had been a Custom long before, among the *Greeks*, to *Deifie* the most *Useful Men*: As St. *Augustin* observes of *Phegous*, the Brother of *Phoroneus*; of *Apis*, King of the *Argives*, who died in *Egypt*; of *Argus*, who had a Temple and Sacrifices allotted to him; of *Phorbas*, *Jasus*, *Schenelus*, who were all Princes among the Old *Greeks*. And therefore it was no wonder Lact. l. 1. c. 11. Aug. de Civ. Dei, l. 18. c. 3, 5.

der such People should give Divine Worship to this Prince, who had brought them into so much Order, in comparison of what they were in before. From hence we find him not only worshipped in *Crete*, where he had several Titles from the Places where his Temples stood; as *Idæus*, *Dictæus*, *Arbius*, *Asius*, *Temillius*, and *Scillius*, &c. but in *Greece*, as *Ithometes*, *Atabyrius*, *Triphylius*, *Olympius*, *Cithæronius*, &c. and whereever the Colonies of *Greeks* in *Asia* were, as at *Tarsus*, St. *Paul*'s own Countrey: And he was called *Sardessius*, from a City of *Lycia*; *Chrysoforeus*, from a Place in *Caria*; *Tarantæus*, from a City in *Bithynia*; *Dolichæus*, from a City in *Comagene*; *Abretanus*, from a Place in *Mysia*; and *Asbameus*, from a Fountain in *Cappadocia*. Is this now any such mighty Argument to prove, that *Jupiter* could not be taken for the Supreme *God*; because in *Lystra*, a City of *Lycaonia*, St. *Paul* and *Barnabas* refused the Worship the People would have given to them, as to *Jupiter* and *Mercury*? Among the *Grecian* Colonies, what wonder is it, if the *Grecian Jupiter* was worshipped? And who ever said, that he was not a *False God*? But, after all this, suppose they did mean the Great and Original *Jupiter*, *the Maker of the World*; had not St. *Paul* and *Barnabas* Reason to turn them from the *Vanities of their Worship*, when they found them so ready to give Divine Honours to Two Men whom they fancied to appear in the Likeness of their *Gods*, by doing a sudden and unexpected Miracle? And if it were lawful, by the Light of Nature, to give Divine Worship of an Inferior Degree to Mankind; what made the Apostles so concern'd, to *run in among them, and to rent their Cloaths, and to cry out, We are men of like Passions with you.* Therefore, all that Strain of *T. G*'s Rhetorick, whereby he endeavours to return Dr. *St.*'s Arguments upon himself from this place, hath no manner of Strength or Pungency in it.

But what saith *T. G.* to Dr. *St.*'s other Argument from Scripture?

Rom. 1. 19. *Viz.* That St. *Paul*, to the *Romans*, doth say, *That which is known of God, was manifest among the Heathens; that his Eternal Power and Godhead were so far discovered, that they were left without excuse in their gross Idolatry.* How could this be, if their *Supreme God*, whom they worshipped, were only an *Arch-devil*? Or doth *T. G.* suppose, that they did own One *True God*, but gave all their Worship to the *Devil*? And since the Name of *Jupiter* was used to express always the Chief God whom they did own, and by such Characters as could only agree to the True God; is it any ways likely, they should never intend to worship him under that Name? When Dr. *St.* hath shewed from *Dio Chrysostom*,

Defence, P. 11, 47. That by *Jupiter they meant the first and greatest God, the Supreme Governor of the World, and King over all Rational Beings.*

*R. P.* I do not find *T. G.* takes any Notice of the other Argument from *Scripture*; but he applies himself to the *Fathers*.

*P. D.* But what saith he to the *Testimonies* Dr. *St.* produced of the

Def. from P. 11. to P. 23. *Writers* of his own *Church*; a full Jury of them, who frankly acknowledge that the Heathens did own and worship One Supreme God?

*P. D.* I suppose he thought none of the rest worth answering: But he finds great fault with the Testimony of *Aquinas*.

*R. P.* This is a rare way of answering. Dr. *St.* produced Twelve several Authors, of good Reputation: *T. G.* takes no notice of Eleven of them; and because he makes some Cavils at the Twelfth, he would have this pass for an Answer to them all.

*R. P.* But

*R. P.* But the Dr. loseth his Credit so much in that, that we need not to examine the rest.

*P. D.* Why so? It is possible a Man, through Haste or Inadvertency, or as *T. G.* expresseth it, *through a casual Undulation of the Visual Rays*, may for once mistake; but doth it follow, that he must do it for Twelve times together? But I have not yet found any Cause for these Clamours; and I suppose there may be as little as to this Testimony: I pray tell me, where lies it?

*R. P. T. G.* makes a great many Words about it; but the short of the Charge is this: *That what* Aquinas *spoke of some of the Philosophers*, viz. *the* Platonicks, *who acknowledged One Supreme God; from whom, they said, all those others (whom they called Gods) did receive their Being*; *Dr.* St. *interprets, as spoken of the Generality of the Heathens; who are there said to acknowledge a Multitude of Gods, properly so called.* Dial. from p. 399. to p. 405.

*P. D.* I know not whether to express greater Shame or Indignation, at this disingenuous Dealing. There needs no other Answer, but to set down *Aquinas*'s Words, and to leave the Reader to construe them. *Hac autem veritate repelluntur Gentiles Deorum multitudinem confitentes, quamvis plures eorum unum Deum summum esse dicerent, à quo omnes alios quos Deos nominabant, creatos esse asserebant*, &c. Can any thing be plainer from these Words, than that those *Gentiles* are refuted, who held a Multitude of Independent Deities; *although the greater Number of them* (Of whom? Is it not of the *Heathens* he spake of before? And where is there one Word of *Platonists* or *Philosophers*, in the whole Sentence?) *do acknowledge One Supreme God, of whom all others whom they called Gods, did receive their Being.* What can be more evident from these Words; than that although some among the Heathens might hold a Multitude of Independent Deities, yet the greater Number did not? The single Question here is, Whether *Plures Gentilium* doth signifie the greater Number of *Gentiles*, or the *Small Number* of *Platonists*, who are not once mentioned? But besides this, Dr. *St.* produces another Testimony out of the same Book of *Aquinas*; where he makes Three several *Schemes* of the Heathen Worship: *Viz.* (1.) Of those who held One First Principle; but thought Divine Worship might be given to Inferior Beings. (2.) Of those who supposed God to be the Soul of the World. (3.) Of those who worshipped Animated Images. If the other had been the General Opinion of the Heathen, he would have ranked it in the first place; *viz.* of those who gave Divine Worship to many Independent Deities; but he doth not so much as mention it, where it had been very proper to do it. And it is plain from this Testimony of *Aquinas*, that it is Idolatry to give Divine Worship to any *Creatures*, although of never so great Excellency. c. Gentes, l. 1. c. 43.

*R. P.* Let us come to the *Fathers*, I beseech you; for my Fingers itch to be at them: For I see, *T. G.* hath taken more than ordinary Pains to prove, *That the Fathers make the Heathens Supreme God to be an Arch-devil.* But it is necessary in the first place to state the Question aright.

*P. D.* I think so too.

*R. P. T. G.* hath taken some pains to do it, to prevent misunderstanding. For he takes notice of Four several Questions which may relate to this Matter. (1.) *Whether the Heathens did not acknowledge one* Dial. p. 310.

*Supreme God? which he yields, and produces several Testimonies of the Fa-*
p. 312, &c. *thers to that purpose.* (2.) *Whether the Heathens did not pretend that they understood this Supreme God by* Jupiter, *and accordingly gave him the Titles due to the Supreme God? This* T. G. *denies not, to be fully proved by* Dr. St.,
p. 316, &c. *but he saith all these Testimonies are impertinent.* (3.) *Whether the Fathers do not acknowledge that this was pretended by the Heathens? This* T.
p. 318. G. *accounts impertinent too: For,* saith he, *they might cite some Sayings of the Heathen to that purpose, and yet be of a contrary Judgment themselves. But the Point in debate between the Dr. and* T. G. *is this;* (4.) *Whether it were the Fathers own sense that* Jupiter *was the Supreme God?*

*P. D.* I pray tell tell me for what end were the *Fathers* appealed to in this dispute about the nature of Idolatry? Was it not to prove *Idolatry* consistent with the Acknowledgement of one Supreme God? For
Def. p. 5. doth not Dr. *St.* propose several ways for the Proof of this concerning the *Heathens*, either the *Testimony* of the Heathens themselves; or of the *Writers* of the *Roman Church*, or of the *Scriptures*, or of those *Fathers* who disputed against their *Idolatry*, or of the *Roman Church* it self? Therefore the *Fathers* were appealed to as *Witnesses* concerning this main Point; and if it appear from them that it was *Idolatry* in the Heathens to own a *Supreme Deity*, and to give *Divine Worship to any created Being*, then the Notion of *Idolatry* will reach to the *Roman* Church. But *T. G.* endeavours to get off from the close Debate of this, which was the most pertinent of all, and would fain substitute another Question in the place of it, which was but a secondary and accidental dispute occasioned by *T. G.*'s saying *that the Heathens Supreme God was an Arch-devil.* Although Dr. *St.* hath proved that was not agreeable to the general sense of the *Fathers*, yet any one may see that quite through his Discourse his chief aim was at stating the *Nature* of *Idolatry* according to the *Sense* of the *Fathers.*
Defence, p. 25. From *Justin Martyr* he shews that the Question between the *Christians* and *Heathens* was not about one *Supreme God*, which he acknowledges to be owned by them; but whether Divine Worship ought in general to be given to any Creature, and in particular to the *Heathen Gods*? And he lays the force of the Christian Doctrine as to Worship, upon that peremptory Declaration of the Will of God; *Thou shalt worship the*
Defence, p. 60, &c. *Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.* The same he shews as to *Athenagoras*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Origen*, *Cyril*, and all the *Fathers* who managed the Dispute against the *Heathen Idolatry.* Is it impertinent to the right stating the Nature of *Idolatry*, to consider whether they who charged the *Heathens* with it, did at the same time confess they owned *One Supreme God*? Doth not *T. G.* himself grant that it is very material towards the right Understanding the *Nature* of *Idolatry* to
Dial. p. 398. consider *what was the design of the Fathers to charge them with Idolatry in? Whether in worshipping the Creature and not the Creator with Divine Worship; or in worshipping more Gods than one properly so called;* (which he seems to fix the Heathen Idolatry upon) or *in giving the same Worship to God and his Creatures* (which Dr. *St.* asserts.) Which Notion soever of these be true, it cannot be said to be impertinent for Dr. *St.* to prove his Notion to be the *Sense* of the *Fathers.* And if the Heathens did acknowledge *One Supreme God*, as *T. G.* grants, and the *Fathers* do allow this in their Disputes of *Idolatry*; which *T. G.* cannot deny; then the Question comes to this, whether they charged them with Idolatry only *for neglecting to worship the Supreme God* which they owned; or in holding *one Supreme and many Supremes* at the same time? For if they believed

lieved *one Supreme God*, as *T. G.* grants, and yet held *many independent Deities* which they worshipped as such, they must hold one Supreme and yet many; for every *independent Deity* must be *Supreme*. I wonder therefore if *T. G.* designed to debate this matter fairly, why he should account the other Questions impertinent; and account that the only Point in debate, Whether according to the *Sense* of the *Fathers*, *Jupiter* was the *Supreme God*?

*R. P.* Do not you remember how Dr. *St.* insulted over him as to the *Sense* of the *Fathers* in this Matter; and had he not Reason then to speak to this Point?

*P. D.* I allow him all the Liberty he can desire, provided he do not reject the main Evidence as to the *Cause* of *Idolatry* to be *impertinent*; which he would cut off by this Trick, that they do not refer to his Question about *Jupiter*. But since you have such a mind to tell me the *Sense* of the *Fathers* in this Matter, let us hear and consider them in order.

*R. P. T. G.* begins as Dr. *St.* doth with *Justin Martyr*: and he shews from him, *that the Devils appearing in human Shapes were the first beginners of Idolatry, the People taking them for Gods, and worshipped their Images.* Dial. p. 287.

*P. D.* This is no great discovery to Dr. *St.* for he takes notice of this very Opinion of *Justin Martyr*. Defence, P. 29.

*R. P. But he makes* Jupiter *to have been one of these Devils in his first Apology*, Where he saith, *the Poets and Mythologists not knowing that the Angels and Dæmons begotten by them had been the Authors of the infamous Practices he there speaks of, attributed them to God himself, and to the Sons begotten by him, and to those who are called his Brethren*, Neptune *and* Pluto.

*P. D.* What follows from hence, I beseech you?

*R. P. That according to the Sense of* Justin Martyr, Jupiter *the Supreme God was a Devil.*

*P. D.* That should be better proved; For how doth it follow from *Justin*'s Words? That which *Justin* saith is, *that what he attributes to Devils, the Poets attribute to God himself, and his Sons*: And what then? It thence follows that *Justin* thought they attributed very unworthy things to *God*, but not that he thought him to be a *Devil*. For doth not the same Author prove that their *Poets* as well as *Philosophers* did own *One Supreme God*, and that *Homer* calls him Emphatically, Θεὸς αὐτὸς, which is the very Expression *Justin* useth in this place, εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν Θεόν; and by that, he saith, is meant the *truly existent Deity*, whom he calls τὸν ὄντως ὄντα Θεόν.

*R. P. But* Justin *saith, the Devils were the Causes of Idolatry, and the Poets say the true God was the Cause; therefore according to* Justin Martyr *their true God was a Devil.*

*P. D.* Which is just like this kind of Reasoning. The *Poets* and *Mythologists* of the *Roman* Church attribute the Miracles wrought by *Images* to the *true God*; others say, they are wrought by the *Power* of the *Devil*; therefore they make the *Papists God* to be a *Devil*. Which is altogether as true Reasoning as the former. For *Justin* saith, *he believes Idolatry to have come from the Devils*; the Poets they say *it came from God*: And although he quotes this Opinion of theirs, it doth not follow that he thought their *God* to be a *Devil*; but that they attributed those Things to *God*, which did come from the *Devil*. So much for the first *Testimony*, let us come to the next; and if the rest prove like it, notwithstanding

withſtanding *T. G.*'s fluttering, all his Fathers will be but a *Covie* of one ſtill.

Defence, P. 288. *R. P.* The next is *Athenagoras, who firſt ſhews from what the Poets and Hiſtorians relate concerning the Heathen Gods, that there was nothing that might induce us to believe* Saturn, Jupiter, Proſerpine, *and the reſt of them to be Gods, but rather that they were Men, and by their Actions Devils: And then that* Jupiter *according to the Interpretation of the Philoſophers was no God.*

*P. D.* Is not this, the ſame *Athenagoras* who ſaid, *that the generality of Mankind were agreed in this, whether they would or no, that there was but One God*? And who proves this from the *Teſtimony* of the *Heathen Poets* and *Philoſophers*, and that with the very Name of *Jupiter* too?

Athenag. Leg. pro Chriſtian. p. 5, 6.

Τῶτον τίμιζε Ζῆνα τὸν δ' ἄγε Θεὸν

Doth *Athenagoras* yield this to be a good Proof concerning *One True God*, and yet deny the *true God* to be meant by *Jupiter*? No; but we muſt conſider a Threefold Senſe of *Jupiter* among the *Fathers*.

(1.) The *Original Jupiter*, the *Father of Gods and Men* among the *Poets*, the *Supreme Mind* and *Governor of the World* among the *Philoſophers*; the *One God* confeſſed by all Mankind; whom *Athenagoras* mentions under that Name, in the Verſes of *Euripides*. And if *Athenagoras* took this *Jupiter* for a *Devil*, he doth not prove any thing to his Purpoſe from thoſe Teſtimonies of the *Poets* and *Philoſophers*: For his Deſign was to vindicate the *Chriſtians* in holding the *Unity* of the *Godhead*, which I deſire *T. G.* to obſerve; *You accuſe us*, ſaith *Athenagoras*, *becauſe we reject your popular Gods, and aſſert One God*; yet ſaith he, *you condemn not your Poets and Philoſophers who applied themſelves moſt to the Conſideration of Things, and agree with us in the Unity of the Godhead.* What force were there in this Argument, if the *God* they owned were not the *True God*, but an *Arch-devil*? How could the *Chriſtians* plead the Conſent of the *Wiſer Heathens* with them, if they owned a *Devil* inſtead of the *true God*? Suppoſe any loyal Subjects in the late Times had been accuſed as Enemies to the Government, would it have paſſed for any Vindication of them to have pleaded that they owned *O. C.* who was a ſingle Perſon, as well as our lawful King? It is true, they both agreed in a ſingle Perſon, but the Rights of thoſe Two ſingle Perſons were ſo oppoſite to each other, that the ſame Men could not be Friends to both, or both be ſaid to own the ſame *Monarchy*. But when the *Chriſtians* pleaded the Conſent of the *Heathens*, it was not meerly to purge themſelves from *Atheiſm*; but to ſhew that the wiſeſt *Heathens* were of their Mind; As *T. G.* confeſſeth, *the Fathers appealed to the Teſtimony of the Conſciences of Men to this purpoſe, as giving Evidence for Chriſtians*, (mark that.) What Evidence was this for *Chriſtians*, unleſs it were not only for *One God*, but for the *True God*? For they who did own *One God*, who was ſo far from being the true, that in the Fathers Judgment, he was the greateſt Enemy to him in the World, *viz.* an *Arch-devil*; theſe were far from giving Teſtimony to the *Chriſtians*; as who would ſay, that the *Indians* who worſhip the *Devil*, do give Teſtimony to the *True God*? If therefore it was the *Arch-devil*, as *T. G.* ſaith, whom the *Poets* and *Philoſophers* according to the *Fathers*, did give Teſtimony to, inſtead of producing their Evidence as they did on all Occaſions, they

Dial p. 312, 313, 314.

ought

ought to have rejected it with Scorn and Indignation. For what Conſent could there be between *God* and the *Devil*? If the *Fathers* thought they owned *one ſupreme Devil*, and yet produced their Teſtimonies to juſtify their Belief of *One True God*, it would have been juſt as if the King's Subjects ſhould have ſaid to *O. C.*'s Friends; why are you angry with us for not ſubmitting to his Government, ſince *D.* and *H.* and *P.* and the reſt, own a *ſingle Perſon* as well as we? True, would they have ſaid, but our Difference is the more irreconcileable, for you are for one ſingle Perſon and we for another; and their Intereſts can never be united, there being a Competition between them for the ſame Power. Thus when *Athenagoras* and the reſt of the *Fathers* produce the *Teſtimonies* of *Euripides*, *Sophocles*, *Plato*, *Ariſtotle*, &c. to ſhew their Conſent with the Chriſtians in the Acknowledgment of *One Supreme God*; we will ſuppoſe the Emperor *Antoninus* to whom *Athenagoras* addreſſed himſelf, to ask him this Queſtion, You produce their Teſtimonies to prove their Conſent with you as to *One Supreme God*; do you mean the *ſame God*; or an *Uſurper* and an *Arch-devil*? If you think it was not the ſame, but his *utter Enemy*, What Madneſs is it to produce thoſe who owned him whom you account the greateſt Uſurper, to prove a Conſent with you, who pretend to diſcover his Uſurpation, and do cry out upon him as the greateſt Enemy to God and Mankind? If you think they meant *the ſame God* with you, who is the *Lord and Governor of the World*, we cannot deny the Force of your Allegations, and judge it unreaſonable to condemn you for that Doctrine, which the wiſeſt among our ſelves did own. Since therefore *T. G.* confeſſeth that the Heathens did own *One Supreme God*, and that under the Name of *Jupiter*, and that the *Fathers* do produce many Teſtimonies of theirs to that purpoſe; and that, as it appears, to ſhew their Conſent with *Chriſtians* as to the *Unity* of the *Godhead*, as *Athenagoras* ſaith expreſly; what can follow more naturally from hence, than that the *Fathers* did look upon that *Jupiter* whom they owned to be the *One Supreme God*, to be the ſame *True God*, whom the Chriſtians worſhipped? And when *Athenagoras* produced the *Teſtimony* of *Plato* concerning *the Maker and Father of the Univerſe*, he immediately adds, ἕνα τὸν ἀγέννητον καὶ ἀΐδιον νοῦν Θεόν· underſtanding thereby *one unbegotten and eternal God.* Was this meant by *Athenagoras* of the *True God*, or of the *Arch-devil*? And from hence he argues thus; If Plato's *Opinion were not Impious or Atheiſtical, neither is ours who hold the ſame God who made the World.* What Force is there in this Arguing, if *Athenagoras* did not look on *Plato's God* and the *Chriſtians* to be the ſame? And in another place ſpeaking of *Plato*'s Saying concerning *Jupiter*, *that he rides firſt in Heaven upon his winged Chariot, ordering and diſpoſing all Things; and an Army of Gods and Dæmons follows him*; he ſubjoyns this Caution, *that this is not to be underſtood of* Jupiter *the Son of* Saturn; *but that this Name belongs to the Maker of all Things.* Can there be a plainer Teſtimony than this, that there was a more ancient and greater *Jupiter* than the *Son* of *Saturn*, and he no leſs than the *Maker of the World*? When *Athenagoras* himſelf makes this Diſtinction, and owns that the Name of *Jupiter* belongs to the *Maker of all Things*, is it poſſible to think that by this *Jupiter*, *Athenagoras* did not mean the *Supreme God* but an *Arch-devil*? But he goes on and ſaith, *that* Plato *added the word Great to* Jupiter *on purpoſe to diſtinguiſh the Celeſtial* Jupiter *from the Terreſtrial, and him that was unbegotten, from him that was begotten; and not only Junior to the Hea-*

Legat. p. 26.

*ven*

*ven and Earth, but to the* Cretans *who ſtole him away to prevent his being killed by his Father.*

(2.) The *Poetical Jupiter.* Of him *Athenagoras* ſpeaks, when he joyns him with *Saturn* and *Proſerpina.* Where he mentions the Poetical *Theology*; and he ſaith, *That* Orpheus, Homer, *and* Heſiod, *were not much inferior in Age to the Gods they deſcribe, as to their Genealogies,* Athen. p. 16. *Shapes, Actions and Paſſions*; which he ſhews at large to be unworthy of any who are called *Gods.* Towards the latter end of his *Apology*, he P. 34. gives the true Account of theſe Things, viz. *that thoſe whom they worſhipped for Gods had formerly been Men of Intereſt and Power, and either through Fear or Flattery had Divine Worſhip given to them*; and particularly of *Jupiter*, he proves from *Callimachus, that he was born in* Crete, *although the Poet will by no means allow that he died and had a Sepulchre there.* From hence he ſhews, *that under the Names of Deified Men the evil Spirits did aſſume the Divine Worſhip which was given to themſelves*; which he proves from the *cruel and impure Actions which they did put Men upon.* He ſhews, *that the* Image *of* Neryllinus *who lived in their time did give Anſwers to thoſe who conſulted it; and ſo did that of* Proteus, *or* Lucian's Peregrinus, who caſt himſelf into the Fire at *Olympia*; ſince therefore the *Images themſelves* could not do theſe things, nor thoſe *whoſe Images* they were, he concludes they were *Evil Spirits* who were buſy about thoſe *Images*, and wrought upon the Imaginations of thoſe who came to conſult them. And who denies that theſe were *Evil Spirits* which drew Men to *Idolatry*, and encouraged them in it, as *Athenagoras* obſerves, who under the Names of great Men did aſſume Divine Worſhip to themſelves? And in this Senſe Dr. *St.* never denied that *Jupiter* of *Crete* was a *falſe God*, and the *Devil* under his Name drew Men to the Practice of *groſs Idolatry.*

(3.) The *Allegorical Jupiter.* For *Athenagoras* ſaith, *that the Poetical* Athen p. 22. *Fables were ſo filthy and baſe, that the Philoſophers had no other way, but to turn them into Allegories; and to interpret them Phyſically of the Nature and Mixture of the Elements. And thus according to* Empedocles, Jupiter *was Fire*, Juno *Earth*, Pluto *Air*, Neſtis *Water. However*, ſaith *Athenagoras, theſe are but Elements, and Parts of Matter, and therefore cannot be Gods nor deſerve Divine Worſhip. The Stoicks made* Jupiter *to be Fire*, Juno *Air*, Neptune *Water. Others made one part of Air to be* Jupiter, *and another* Juno: However they cooked and dreſſed their *Allegories*, they were but *Pork* ſtill; it could ariſe no higher than a Worſhip of the *Elements* inſtead of *God.* And now let any one judge how ſufficiently *T. G.* hath proved from *Athenagoras*, that the *Supreme God of the Heathens was an Arch-devil.* I pray proceed to your next.

*R. P. Theophilus Antiochenus* ſaith, *that neither the Mother of the Gods, nor her Children are Gods, but Idols, the Works of Men's Hands, and moſt impure Devils:* Which *T. G.* ſaith, *was cited by him in the ſame Page with* Origen *before, although Dr.* St. *makes ſo much ſport with him about crying out the Fathers, when he named, he ſaith, only* Origen.

*P. D.* And was not this true? Doth *T. G.* name any more than *Origen* to prove that *Jupiter* according to the *Fathers* was an *Arch-devil?* Look the place and you will find it punctually true. I grant he mentions *Theophilus Antiochenus* in the ſame Page; but to what purpoſe? Cath. no Idol. p. 349, 350. Not to prove the *Supreme God an Arch-devil*; but the *inferior Deities to be inferior Devils*: Which was a thing never denied by Dr. *St.*; and therefore this Teſtimony ſignifies as little now, as it did before.

*R. P.* But

*R. P.* But you will not ſo eaſily reconcile *Tertullian's Teſtimonies with Dr. St.'s abominable pretence*, as *T. G.* calls it, *that the God of the* Romans *was the true God.* Dial. p. 290.

*P. D.* It is one thing to ſay, *the God of the* Romans *was the true God*, and another to ſay, *they did worſhip the True God under the Title of* Jupiter O. M. For the former may imply that they had no other *Gods* beſides him to whom they gave Divine Worſhip; which I dare ſay never came into Dr *St's* Head. But all that he aſſerted was, that the *Romans* did own and worſhip *the Supreme God* under the *Titles* of *Jupiter O. M.* and gave ſuch Characters and Deſcriptions of him as could agree to none but the *Lord and Governor of the World*: Which he proved from many Teſtimonies of *Cicero*, *Seneca*, and others the graveſt of the *Roman Writers*. And what doth *Tertullian* ſay, to take off theſe Teſtimonies?

*R. P.* Firſt, he ſaith, *we are not ignorant that thoſe who act and are pleaſed and counterfeit a Divinity under thoſe Names (of dead Men) and conſecrated Statues, are wicked Spirits*, i. e. *Devils.* Tertul de ſpect c. 10

*P. D.* And what then I beſeech you? Was *Jupiter O. M.* one of theſe *dead Men*? if not, to what purpoſe is this *Teſtimony* brought; unleſs it be as Countrey People ſay *for want of a better*?

*R. P.* Not ſo, for he ſaith elſewhere, *We worſhip one God whom ye all know by the Light of Nature: As for the reſt whom you think to be Gods, we know them to be Devils.* Ad Scap. c. 2.

*P. D.* Admirable! who can ſtand before ſuch Demonſtrations? *Tertullian* here grants they all knew *the True God*, therefore the *Supreme God* of the *Romans* was a *Devil.* He might as well have brought another Teſtimony out of the Book *de ſpectaculis*; *No Man can be ignorant of that which Nature ſuggeſts, that God is the Maker of the World.* Were the *Romans* ignorant of that which *Tertullian* ſaith, *no Man could be ignorant of*? And when they made uſe of the moſt proper Epithets of *Good* and *Great* to deſcribe and worſhip him by, is it probable they ſhould not underſtand him? Or that *Tertullian* ſhould think their *Supreme God* was an *Arch-devil*; when he ſaith in the Words cited by *T. G. he was the ſame God whom the Chriſtians worſhipped?* Doth *T. G.* conſider what he writes? when he puts down this for a Teſtimony againſt Dr. *St. We worſhip one God whom ye all know by the Light of Nature.* Doth it not hence follow, that the *God whom the Gentiles knew*, was the ſame whom the *Chriſtians* worſhipped? and he was not certainly an Arch-devil. I pray judge, whoſe *Pretence* is the more *abominable* upon his own Teſtimonies. De ſpect. c. 2.

*R. P.* For all this, *Tertullian* ſhews, *that* Jupiter *worſhipped in the Capitol was not the true God. For ſpeaking of the Supplications the Heathens made there*, he ſaith, *they were averſe both from God and Heaven.* Apol. c 40.

*P. D.* And had he not great Reaſon to ſay ſo, when he ſaith, *The* Romans *with full Bellies, and wallowing in all kind of Luxury, did offer up their Sacrifices to obtain Rain, and thought to have it drop down from the Capitol upon them, if the People went barefoot thither?* Doth not God himſelf tell the *Jews* they *were far from him*, when they ſeemed moſt *to draw nigh unto him? i.e.* their Sacrifices and Oblations ſignified nothing, while they continued in their Sins. I ſhould not ſtick to ſay that intemperate and wicked Men *are averſe both from God and Heaven*, though they walk Barefoot, and make the richeſt Preſents to the true God.

But how doth this prove they did not intend to worſhip the *true God* there? Although withal, their Worſhip, even in the *Capitol*, was Idolatrous Worſhip; both as to the *Image* of *Jupiter*, and the *Conjunction* of their *Gods* with him; therefore whatever their *Intention* was as to the *Worſhip* of *Jupiter O. M.* their *Supplications* might well be diſpleaſing to the *True God*; and on that account they might be ſaid to be *averſe from God and Heaven.*

*R. P.* I have another Teſtimony of *Tertullian* ſtill good; which if I miſtake not will put you hard to it. It is in his Apologetick. *We are eſteemed not to be* Romans *but injurious to them, becauſe we do not worſhip the God of the* Romans. *'Tis well he is the God of all, whether we will or no. But among you it is lawful to worſhip any thing but the true God; as if he were not the great God of all, whoſe we are all. What could be ſaid more expreſs to remove that abominable Pretence of the Doctor's, that the God of the* Romans *was the true God?*

Apolog. c. 24.

Dial. p. 290.

*P. D.* I ſee no Reaſon in the World for your accounting the Doctor's *Pretence abominable*, unleſs he juſtified the way of *Worſhip* then uſed, which he confeſſeth to be *abominable* both in the *old Romans* and others who too much imitate their *Idolatries*. Obſerve, that *Tertullian* ſpeaks of their *Worſhip*, which being *Idolatrous*, the Chriſtians had juſt Reaſon to refuſe joyning with the *Romans* in it. From hence they were accuſed for worſhipping *another God* from him whom the *Romans* worſhipped; and *Tertullian* before mentions the ſeveral Suſpicions which they had concerning the *God* of the *Chriſtians*; ſome ſaid *it was the Head of an Aſs, ſome the Croſs, ſome the Sun, and ſome ſet forth a ridiculous Picture with the Ears of an Aſs, a Book and a Gown, and called this the God of the Chriſtians. Tertullian* upon this declares that the Chriſtians worſhipped *the God that made the World, and none elſe*; or as he ſaid to *Scapula, the God whom all Men know by Nature.* And in that very Chapter from whence thoſe Words are cited, he ſaith, *it was the common Opinion among the* Romans, *that there was one God higher and more powerful than all the reſt, of perfect Wiſdom and Majeſty: For the greateſt part*, ſaith he, did make this *Scheme* of *Divinity, that the chief Power lay in one God, to whom the reſt were only Miniſterial and Subſervient.* I am afraid *T. G.* will allow my Senſe of theſe Words no more than he is wont to do Dr. *St.*'s. I will therefore give you *Tertullian*'s own Words. *Nam & ſic plerique diſponunt Divinitatem, ut imperium ſummæ Dominationis eſſe penes unum, officia ejus penes multos velint.* Which Words are of mighty weight and conſequence in this Matter, towards the right underſtanding *Tertullian*'s Meaning. Here we ſee from whence *Aquinas* had his *plures eorum*, and in what Senſe it muſt be underſtood. From hence it appears, that the Generality of the Heathens did not aſſert a Multitude of *independent Gods*: nor were charged with *Idolatry* on that account. And to let us ſee whom they meant by this *Supreme God*, he produces in the next Words the place of *Plato* mentioned by *Athenagoras, of the great* Jupiter *in Heaven with his Army of Gods and Dæmons.*

Apolog. c. 16.

*R. P.* But *Tertullian* ſaith, *the Chriſtians did not worſhip the God of the* Romans; *and the* Romans *would not ſuffer them to worſhip the True God: How could this be, if they did own and worſhip the True God?*

*P. D.* I will tell you, The *God of the* Romans was he who was worſhipped after an *Idolatrous Manner* in the *Capitol* and elſewhere: The *Chriſtians* choſe rather to dye than to worſhip *God* after this manner: The *Romans* would permit no other kind of *Worſhip* than their own:

And

And when the *Christians* refused to joyn in their Worship, they could not believe, let them say what they would, that they worshipped *that God whom all Men know by the Light of Nature.* The *God* of the *Romans* is *the God worshipped after the* Roman *manner*; as the *God of the* Jews, of the *Turks*, and of the *Christians*, is the *God* worshipped according to those *several Laws*, although he be the *same God* in himself the *Maker and Governor of the World.* This place then doth imply no more, than that the *Roman Religion* as it stood at that Time, and the Christian, were inconsistent; but it doth not follow from hence that the *Romans* did not intend to *worship* the *Supreme God* under the Title of *Jupiter O. M.*

*R. P.* Before we leave *Tertullian*, I have something more to say to you concerning him: It is about a Passage of his Book *ad Scapulam* cited by Dr. *St.* where he endeavours to prove, that the *Heathens* Jupiter *was the Supreme God, by a Miracle wrought upon the Heathens Supplications to him under the Name of* Jove. Dial. p. 371, *&c.*

*P. D.* Are you sure that Dr. *St.* ever meant any such thing?

*R. P. T. G.* quotes his words, *God*, saith he, *shewed himself to be the powerful God, by what he did upon their Supplications to him under the Name of* Jove.

*P. D.* But doth not Dr. *St.* expressly say, *that it was upon the Prayers of Christians, that Miracle was wrought?* Defence, P. 47.

*R. P.* Yes, *T. G.* takes notice of that, and from thence proves that he wilfully corrupted *Tertullian*'s Text, and makes a very Tragical Business of it. Methinks I see the great *Dionysius* with his *Birchen Scepter* walking round him, telling him of his Faults, and then one or two Lashes; but lest his Pain should be too soon at an end, he takes off his Hand, and walks the other turn, with a Stern and Magisterial Countenance, bidding others beware, and telling them what an Example he will make of him, he lays on again, with such a Spring in his Arm, and so many repeated Strokes, that I even pity the poor Doctor, and I could not think *Dionysius* himself could have expressed more Severity on such an Occasion; but I consider, it is against an *Heretick*, and it is necessary sometimes to let you see how sharp we can be. Dial. p. 284.

*P. D.* You need not to tell us that; but we had need to keep out of your Lash as long as we can, for we expect no great Kindness from you, if ever we fall under it. But why should *T. G.* think that Dr. *St.* designed to corrupt *Tertullian*'s Sense in that place, when himself had before owned that *the Miracle was wrought by the Prayers of the Christians*? He would never have done this, if he intended the other. I do confess the Words, as they lye, are capable of that Construction *T. G.* puts upon them; but in common Ingenuity they ought to be understood according to his own former Sense of them; unless the Force of the Argument lay in the other Sense; which I do not perceive it doth. For Dr. *St.* designed to prove in that place from *Tertullian*, *that the Heathens did acknowledge one Supreme God, from the Testimony of their Consciences, and lifting up their Hands and Eyes to Heaven upon any great Occasion:* And then brings in those Words before mentioned, which are there produced for no other end, but to shew that the *same powerful God was owned by the Gentiles and Christians* in that famous Miracle. He did not intend there to prove, as *T. G.* suggests, *that* Jupiter *whom they worshipped in the Capitol was this one Supreme Being*, from the Testimony of *Tertullian* and the Miracle wrought by *God himself upon the Heathens Supplications to him under the Name of* Jove; And where he did purposely Defence, p. 92.

posely set himself to prove this, he there confesses that the Miracle was wrought *at the Prayers of the Christians*, and that the whole Army made the Exclamation, *Deo Deorum & qui solus potens*, *whereby they did in Jovis nomine Deo nostro testimonium reddere*, saith *Tertullian*; and Dr. *St.* adds, *that the Heathens did intend this Honour to their own* Jove. From whence it appears that all the Force of the Argument from this Testimony lies in this, that the Heathens did confess there was *One Supreme and Powerful God*, *whom they called* Jove. And this I say in Dr. *St.'s* Name is the whole Strength and Force of his Argument, and that he never thought of what *T. G.* imposes upon him, *viz. that God wrought that Miracle upon the Supplications of the Heathens*, *to prove that* Jove *was the True God:* which was not necessary to his Design. But I do insist upon it, as an invincible Proof of that which he intended, the Acknowledgment of *One Supreme God*, *whom they called* Jove. I do yield then, that the Miracle was wrought by the Prayers of the Christians; that the Christians did not pray to God under the Name of *Jove*; that the *Heathens* did attribute the Honour of the Miracle to their *Jove*; that in the Titles they gave to him on this Occasion they did give Testimony to the mighty Power of that *God* whom the Christians worshipped; I will not deny, that *M. Aurelius* did write a Letter to the Senate, wherein he acknowledged this Miracle to be wrought by the Christians, (although it may be that was not the *Letter* which is extant in *Baronius.*) But after all these Concessions, I say, that Dr. *St.'s* Argument holds good, that the *Heathens did acknowledge One Supreme God under the Name of* Jove. For what could the Army mean else, by that Acclamation, *Deo Deorum & qui solus potens?* From whence it unavoidably follows, that the Heathen Army did acknowledge *One Supreme and Omnipotent God*, whom they called *Jove:* And in *Antoninus* his Column at *Rome*, this *God* is described under the Title of *Jupiter Pluvius:* Therefore according to the Sense of the Heathen Army, this *Jupiter* was *Deus Deorum*, *& solus Potens.* *T. G.* could not but see, that herein lay the Strength of Dr. *St.'s* Argument; but he dissembles it, and makes him to aim at what he never thought of, and catching hold of an ambiguous Expression, he runs away with that, and uses him with more Severity than ever *Dionysius turned Pedant*, *or reforming Stepmother used*; which are his own Expressions upon a far less Occasion.

*R. P. But* Tertullian *distinguishes the true God from him who was worshipped under the Name of* Jove.

*P. D.* I deny not, that *Tertullian* doth distinguish the *Worship* of the *True God* from the *Worship* of *Jove.* And when the *Heathens* attributed such Miracles to their *Jupiter*, with a design thereby to justify the *Heathen Worship*, the Christians had great Reason to stand upon this Distinction; and to complain that what the *Christians* obtained by Prayers and Fasting, they attributed to their *Jupiter*, *i. e.* what the Christians hoped would convince them of their *Idolatry*, they used for an Argument to prove that *God* was not displeased with it. But it doth not follow, from any thing *Tertullian* hath said, that he did not suppose the *Heathens* did not intend to *worship* the *True God* under their *Jupiter*, when he confesses the greatest part of them did suppose one Supreme God, and that the Christians worshipped the same God whom all Men knew by the Light of Nature.

*R. P.* What

*R. P.* What say you to *Clemens Alexandrinus, who affirms the Gods of the Heathens to be Devils; and among the rest he reckons up* Jupiter *himself; so far was he from thinking* Jupiter *to be the true God?* Dial. p. 290.

*P. D.* Dr. *St.* had prevented this Objection, by saying that in that place *Clemens* speaks of the *Poetical Theology*, and of *Jupiter* of *Crete*; but withal he shews, not only that *Clemens* doth acknowledge that all Mankind had a natural Knowledge of the true God, but that they meant him under the Name of *Jupiter*: And commends the manner of Speaking concerning God as *grave and decent*, where *the Divine Perfections are attributed to* Jupiter: He quotes a Saying of *Xenocrates* wherein he calls God, Ὕπατον Δία, *the Supreme Jove*, and some others of a like Nature. Which seem to be as plain Evidences as Dr. *St.* could desire. And what Answer doth *T. G.* give to them? Defence, P. 75. P. 77.

*R. P.* He saith, *it doth not follow from hence that it was the Sense of* Clemens *himself, that* Jupiter *who was worshipped in the Temples was that True God. And his meaning was not to assert* Jupiter *to be that Supreme Being, but from the Epithets and Titles of Omniscient, Omnipotent,* &c. *which the Poets and Philosophers attributed unto God under the Name of* Jupiter, *to convince them, that there was but one Supreme Being, Maker and Governor of the World.* Dial. p. 360.

*P. D.* His Design then was to convince them of that, which he proves they all knew already. If they had such a Knowledge of God, as *T. G.* grants that *Clemens* doth prove from their Testimonies, either it was the *True God* they knew, or a *false God* or an *Arch-devil.* If the latter, they do not reach to what he brings them for, which was to prove the imbred Notion of one Supreme Disposer of things; if the former, then all those Titles and Epithets did express the *True God*; according to *Clemens* his own Sense of them. But doth *T. G.* think *that they gave the Titles and Epithets of Omnipotent, Omniscient,* &c. *to the Devil*? and that *Clemens* believed it at the same time, when he proves from hence that all Men have the natural Knowledge of *God*? If he can think so, he must make *Clemens* a Man of much Reading, but of no Judgment. But I pray reflect a little; *T. G.* confesses that *Clemens* saith, *that those Epithets were attributed to* Jupiter *with a great deal of Decency and Gravity concerning God*; then according to *T. G.* the Devil may *very decently and gravely* be said to be an *Omnipotent and Omniscient Devil.* For I pray observe but this one Passage, and you will find what pitiful Shifts *T. G.* is put to. The things which the Poets attribute to *Jupiter* in express Terms *Clemens* saith *are spoken with great Decorum of God:* And at the same time he grants, that they meant *God* by their *Jupiter*; what then follows but that although they used the Name *Jupiter*, yet under that Name they spake those things of *God* which were very agreeable to him. No, saith T. G. *this is not his Meaning, but that they spake those Things concerning their* Jupiter, *which being applied to the True God would be spoken with great Gravity and Decency.* Which in plain terms is, that they attributed the *Perfections* of *God* to the *Arch-devil*, which was very ill done of them one would think, and horrible *Blasphemy*; But *however*, saith *T. G. these things may be said to be spoken with great Gravity and Decency concerning God, because if you take them from the Devil and apply them to God, they are decent Expressions.* Let us suppose *James Naylor* riding through the Streets of *Bristol*, assuming to himself the *Title* of the *Son* of *God*, and some of his Followers crying *Hosanna to the Son of David:* would *T. G.* say *this were spoken with Decency and Gravity*; be- Dial. p. 361. Dial. p. 359, &c.

cause

cauſe it would be ſo, if it it were rightly applied to his Son *Chriſt Jeſus*? *T. G.* doth not ſeem here to conſider wherein the *Decency* of Speech lies; for there is the greateſt *Indecency*, nay *Blaſphemy* in the Miſapplication of the beſt Titles and moſt glorious Attributes. And were there no other Reaſon to convince me of the Senſe of the *Fathers* in this Matter, this alone were ſufficient; that if *T. G's Hypotheſis* were true, all thoſe great Things which the *Heathens* ſpake of their *Jupiter* were *moſt Abominable Blaſphemies*; for the *Divine Perfections* were attributed to the chief of *Devils*. And if to attribute the miraculous Works of *God* to the *Devil* be *the Sin againſt the Holy Ghoſt*; what then is it to give to the *Devil* all the *Perfections of God* himſelf? And yet, if *T. G.* ſay true, the *Fathers* muſt believe that the moſt learned and wiſe of the *Heathens* did ſo, when they ſpake of the *Wiſdom*, and *Power*, and *Goodneſs* of their *Supreme Jupiter*: And if they did believe they were guilty of ſuch horrible *Blaſphemy*, would they ſo often quote, approve, extol theſe Sayings as they do? Would they not rather have reproved, cenſured, and condemned them for them, as the moſt intolerable Reproaches of the Divine Nature? Would they have born ſuch Things in *Plato*, *Euripides*, or any other *Philoſopher* or *Poet*? For to call a Stone, a Stock, a dead Man, a *God*; to attribute Life, Senſe, Underſtanding to meer Matter, were tolerable *Blaſphemies* in compariſon with making the *Devil* to be the *Supreme Governor of the World*; to be *One and All*; to be *infinite Wiſdom* as well as *Power*; and yet all theſe muſt be thus given to the *Devil* by the wiſeſt *Poets* and *Philoſophers* which the *Heathens* ever had. Nay farther, their beſt and moſt underſtanding Men who are moſt commended by the *Fathers* themſelves, muſt be the greateſt *Blaſphemers* of all others, and be thought ſo by the *Fathers* at the ſame time when they magnify their Sayings, for the *Wiſdom*, *Gravity*, and *Decency* contained in them. This is ſo groſs, ſo wild, ſo abſurd an Imagination as could hardly enter into any Man's Head who had any manner of Eſteem for the *Fathers*. And I would adviſe *T. G.* rather to let the *Fathers* quite alone, than to fix ſuch Abſurdities upon them.

*R. P.* Methinks you are grown very warm of a ſudden; but I have another *Father* to cool you; and he is *Minucius Felix*.

*P. D.* He is but a *Paterculus*, a *very diminutive Father*, as *T. G.* ſpeaks; however I hope he is able to ſpeak for himſelf.

*R. P.* He ſaith, *the impure Spirits lurking in the conſecrated Statues gained to themſelves the Authority and Eſteem of a Deity that was there preſent.*

*P. D.* And what then? How often muſt you be told, that the Queſtion is not, whether the *Devils* were not aſſiſting in the *Practice* of *Idolatry*? Which Dr. *St.* never queſtioned; either by Preſence in Conſecrated Images, or by aſſuming Divine Honours, under the Names of Deified Men: But this doth not come up to the Queſtion in hand; which is, Whether the *Fathers* did not believe they did intend to worſhip the *Supreme God*, under the Name and Titles of *Jupiter O. M.*? I will make this plain to you, that (if poſſible) you may underſtand the Difference of theſe Queſtions. You know what Boaſts are made in your Church, of the Miracles wrought by our *Lady* of ſuch and ſuch a Place; as of *Mointague*, *Hall*, *Loretto*, &c. What do you mean by this; but that ſuch *Images* which are there of her did affect them; not by the Power of the Wood or Stone, but of ſome Spiritual Power which was preſent in or about them. Suppoſe now a Perſon who hath heard

heard of the Coming of *Satan* with *Signs* and *lying Wonders*, ſhould believe that the *Evil Spirits* did endeavour to retrieve *Idolatry* in the Chriſtian World, after the Way by which they advanced it in the Heathen World; and ſo concludes, that they work theſe Pretended Miracles: Might not ſuch a one ſay, *That impure Spirits lurk in your Conſecrated Images; and there receive Divine Worſhip under the Names of Saints and Angels*; and yet at the ſame time believe that you worſhip *One Supreme God*?

*R. P.* But here the Caſe is different: For *Minucius* ſaith, *That* Saturn, *and* Serapis, *and* Jupiter, (*mark that*) *confeſs themſelves to be Devils.* Dial. p. 291.

*P. D.* Two ways *Jupiter* might be a *Devil*, and yet not prejudice Dr. *St.*'s Aſſertion. (1.) As he aſſumed the *Honours* given to the *Poetical Jupiter*; who was really a *Prince* of *Crete*: But the *Poets*, by attributing to him the Villanies of many others, (as to the Raviſhing of Women, &c.) had made him one of the greateſt *Monſters* of *Wickedneſs* that ever was: And therefore, it was no wonder the *Devil* ſhould be worſhipped under his Name, (not *intentionally*, but *terminatively*) in as much as all this Worſhip ended in the Service of the *Devil*; who was always very active to ſubdue the Minds of Men to the Folly and Wickedneſs of Idolatry. (2.) As he was buſy about *Conſecrated Images*, even to the *Supreme Jupiter*. Thus, although the *Greeks* and *Romans* might ſet up *Images*, with *Scepters*, and *Globes*, and *Thunderbolts* in their Hands, on purpoſe to declare that they intended to worſhip the *Supreme God* by them; yet this way of Worſhip being ſo diſagreeable to the Divine Nature and Perfections, God might juſtly ſuffer the Impure Spirits to be active in thoſe very *Images*, which were *conſecrated* to himſelf: And they might by this means run away with that Honour, which they intended to give to the *Divine Majeſty*. But the Queſtion ſtill remains; Whether, notwithſtanding all this, the Heathens did not deſign to worſhip the *Supreme God*, under the Name of *Jove*? And nothing of this Nature doth ſhew, that the *Fathers* believed the contrary: And as to *Minucius Felix*, Dr. *St.* had produced a material Paſſage out of him to prove, *That they who make* Jove *the Chief God, are only deceived in the Name, but agree in the Power.*

*R. P.* I am glad you mention that Place; for *T. G.* hath at large proved, *That* Dr. St. *hath corrupted both the Senſe and Words of* Minucius, *to make him ſpeak as he would have him.* Dial. p. 354.

*P. D.* I am now ſo uſed to theſe falſe and ſhameleſs Charges of *T. G.* about Dr. *St.*'s *Corrupting of Authors*, that I dare ſtand the ſhock, let *T. G.* make uſe of all his Strength and Skill.

*R. P. T. G.* ſaith, *That* Minucius *intended nothing leſs than to aſſert* Jupiter *to be the One Supreme God; but that he argued only* ad hominem, (*as we ſay*) *from what the wiſer Heathens pretended they thought of* Jupiter; *That they ought to acknowledge but One Supreme God, Maker and Governor of the World. And the Deſign and Senſe of* Minucius *was this; That although they were deceived, in their Pretence of aſſigning* Jupiter *to be the Supreme God; yet by what they affirmed of him,* viz. *That he was the Prince, or the Chief; and the Poets ſetting forth One Father of Gods and Men; they were ſufficiently convinced, that they ought to acknowledge but One Supreme and Undivided Power, by which the World was made and govern'd: Which was the Point* Minucius *was proving in that place. But the Doctor, by putting in, and leaving out what he thought might make*

*for*

*for his Advantage, hath corrupted the very Text of* Minucius, *to make it ſpeak his Senſe.*

*P. D.* A very heavy Charge! But what if there be no ground for all this? Is not *T. G.* a Man of admirable Dexterity, and unparallel'd Ingenuity? I will take *T. G.*'s own Tranſlation of the Words; and if from thence all that Dr. *St.* ſaith, doth follow, there can be certainly no Cauſe for all theſe Clamours. *Thoſe alſo,* ſaith he, *who will have* Jupiter *to be the Prince, or Chief, are deceived in the Name, but agree as to the Unity of Power.* The matter lies within a narrow Compaſs: Either they who agreed as to the *Unity of Power*, and called that *Power* by the Name of *Jove*, did mean the *ſame* God with *Minucius*, or not. If they meant the *ſame God*, Dr. *St.* gives the true Senſe of *Minucius*; for then, they who make *Jove the Chief God*, are *only deceived in the Name, and agree in the Power*: (And it is ridiculous Pedantry, to quarrel at his Tranſlating, *Qui Jovem Principem volunt*, *They who make* Jove *the Chief God.* And for putting in *only*, it is no more than the Senſe implies: For if they agree in the Thing, they muſt be *only* deceived in the Name.) This is therefore the ſingle Point to be debated; Whether, according to *Minucius*, they underſtood the *ſame God*, or not? And to make this out; I deſire no other Method than what *T. G.* propoſes; *viz.* To conſider the *Deſign* of *Minucius* in that place. *Providence being ſuppoſed,* he ſaith, *the Queſtion is, Whether the World be Governed by One, or more? And after other Arguments for Monarchical Government in general, he produces the Conſent of Mankind in Lifting up their Hands to Heaven, and Calling upon God, and ſaying, God is great, God is true; and, if God give. Is this,* ſaith he, *the Voice of Nature in the Common People; or the Confeſſion of a Chriſtian?* Where nothing can be more evident, than the Conſent between the *Voice* of *Nature*, and *the Confeſſion of a Chriſtian*, as to the *ſame God.* And then it immediately follows; *Et qui Jovem Principem volunt, falluntur in nomine, ſed de unâ Poteſtate conſentiunt.* Theſe agree too as to the *Unity* of *Power, who would have* Jove *to be Chief.* Is there not all the Reaſon that may be, to underſtand this Agreement to be with thoſe mentioned before; viz. *the Common People* and *Chriſtians*; who all conſent in the *Unity* of *Power*? But theſe call that *Power* by the Name of *Jove:* And although *Minucius* thinks they are deceived, in attributing that *Name to God*; yet he yields that they agreed in the Thing. This is the plain and eaſy Senſe of *Minucius:* Let us now conſider *T. G.*'s Senſe of theſe Words, and ſee how well that agrees with his Deſign. His Senſe is this: *They who would have* Jupiter *to be the Prince or Chief, were agreed as to the Unity of Power; but were ſo much deceived, not only in the Name, but in the Thing it ſelf, that they attributed this Power, not to God, but to the Devil.* For, ſaith *T. G.*, Minucius *his own Thoughts were, That this* Jupiter *was a Devil.* Let this be ſuppoſed, and his Meaning is this: *The Common People call upon God, and ſay, God is true; God is great;* and *therein agree with the Confeſſion of Chriſtians; and they who will have* Jove, i. e. *the Devil to be the Chief of Gods, do agree as to the Unity of Power.* They who make *God* to be *Chief*, and the *Devil* to be *Chief*, do both agree that *One* is *Chief*, I grant: But will any Man of common Senſe ſay, only *that theſe are deceived in the Name*; who thinks at the ſame time they mean the *Devil?* Are they not deceived in much more than *the Name*; in the *very Thing* it ſelf? Do they not ſet up an *Uſurper*, inſtead of *God*; and his moſt Inveterate Enemy; and

attri-

attribute *Infinite* and *Undivided Power* to him? And is this dwindling Expreſſion fit for a Chriſtian; to ſay only, *falluntur in Nomine; they are deceived in the Name?* No: But he ought to have told them, they were deceived much more in the Thing, than in the Name. It was but a Trifle, in Compariſon, what Name they uſed, if their Senſe and Meaning were good. Call him *Jove*, or what they pleaſed, if they meant the *ſame Thing*, it was only a Difference about a Name: But if they did really attribute the *Divine Perfections to the Devil*; this was a Crime of the higheſt nature, it was *notorious Blaſphemy*; and no true Chriſtian could paſs it over ſo gently and ſlightly, as *Minucius* doth, if he were of *T. G.*'s Opinion. But to convince us that he was far from it, he afterwards produces the Conſent of *Philoſophers* with the *Chriſtians*; *So*, he ſaith, (in the ſame Page of the *Leyden Edition*) *that they did conſent with them.* And ſurely it was *no Conſent with Chriſtians*, to give the *Divine Perfections* to the *Devil.* Speaking of *Thales*, he ſaith, *Vides Philoſophi principalis nobiſcum penitus Opinionem conſonare.* (I forbear to tranſlate, leſt *T. G.* ſhould want Matter to fill up ſome Empty Pages, as he did, by proving that *volunt* doth not ſignify *Making*, &c.) However, *Minucius* ſhews, that this *Prince* of *Philoſophers* did fully agree with the *Chriſtians.* Wherein, I beſeech you? In attributing that *Power* to the *Devil*, which they give to *God*? This is an Agreement, which, I dare ſay, *no Chriſtian* would ever own. And therefore it muſt be, in acknowledging the *ſame Divine Being* which the Chriſtians did. And after he hath reckoned up the ſeveral Opinions of the moſt noted *Philoſophers*, he hath this remarkable Expreſſion; *Expoſui opiniones omnium fere Philoſophorum, quibus illuſtrior gloria eſt Deum unum multis licet deſignaſſe nominibus: I have ſet down the Opinions of almoſt all the famous Philoſophers, who all ſet forth one God though under many Names:* And leſt any ſhould fall into *T. G.*'s extravagant Imagination, that this was not a *Conſent in the ſame Being*, but as to a meer *Unity of Power*, though lodged in the *Devil* himſelf, he adds theſe Words, *Ut quivis arbitretur, aut nunc Chriſtianos philoſophos eſſe, aut philoſophos fuiſſe jam tunc Chriſtianos.* Let *T. G.* conſtrue this to his Senſe, if he can for his Heart. Would any Man in the World, who believed the *Heathens Supreme God to be the Devil*, have ſaid, either that the *Chriſtians* now were *Philoſophers*, or *the Philoſophers then were Chriſtians*, *i. e.* that thoſe who aſſerted that *God*, and thoſe who ſaid, the *Devil were ſupreme Governor of the World*, were of the *ſame Opinion.* Which is ſo fooliſh, ſo ridiculous an Aſſertion, that I wonder to find *T. G.* reſolve to maintain it. And I now deſire you, or any Man to judge whether *the half dozen Fathers* T. G. hath produced before *Origen*, can amount to a *Covey* of *One.* I have exerciſed great Patience in examining theſe Teſtimonies, and not after *T. G.*'s way turned off all the reſt, becauſe one was defective; and if you have any more that ſpeak to the point, I am content to give you all the Satisfaction you can deſire, provided they prove more than that in general, *the Gentiles ſacrificed to Devils*, which was never denied.

*R. P.* T. G. produces the *Teſtimonies* of *Euſebius*, *Athanaſius*, S. *Cyprian*, S. *Chryſoſtom*, S. *Hierom* and others. Dial. p. 293, &c.

*P. D.* To what purpoſe?

*R. P. To prove that they were wicked Spirits who delighted in their Worſhip and Sacrifices.*

*P. D.* Who ever denied this? Will *T. G.* quote the *Fathers* from one end to the other, to prove *that all Men are Sinners?* Name me those who seem to speak to the point, and I will answer them.

*R. P.* You cannot deny that *Arnobius*, *Lactantius*, and S. *Augustin* do speak to the point *about* Jove *being worshipped as the Supreme God*, will you hear them?

*P. D.* Yes; what have you to say more about them?

Dial. p. 296. *Arnobius* saith, *that* Jupiter O. M. *to whom the Capitol was Dedicated, was not the True Omnipotent God:* And *Lactantius makes* Jupiter *the King of those Celestial Gods, which the Evil Spirits feigned.*

*P. D.* Are not these the *Two Persons* whom Dr. *St.* goes about to excuse for applying the *Poetical Fables* to *Jupiter O. M.*?

Dial. p. 320. *R. P. That is a fine way of defending the Fathers, to take the Parts of the Heathens against them*; as Dr. *St.* doth.

*P. D.* He never doth it as to the *main* of the *Cause*, as to any of them (which were to take the Part of *Idolatry* against *Christianity*; which in my Opinion, others are far more liable to the guilt of than he) nor doth he charge any of them with wholly mistaking the *State* of the *Question*; but he instanceth in two *Rhetoricians* (who must be excused in many other Things, as it were easy to shew) and he saith of them, that they could not forbear giving a cast of their former Employment in this Matter. And when Dr. *St.* saith, we ought not to charge the Heathens with more than they were guilty of; doth *T. G.* think we ought? But I am of another Opinion, though we should grant their *Supreme God* to be a *Devil*, for *we ought to give the Devil his due.*

Dial. p. 324, 325. *R. P.* But what say you to S. *Augustin*, whom Dr. *St.* represents as the most baffled by the *Heathens* in this point? *Is not this kind of Procedure more suitable to the Design of* Julian, *than of the Reformation?*

*P. D.* Cannot a Man write against your *Idolatry*; but he must be another *Julian*? *i. e.* A Man cannot write like a *Christian*, but he must be an *Apostate.* Are you the only *Christians* in the World? And your Peculiar Doctrines the only *Christianity*? If it be, it is a *Christianity*, which the *Christian Church* never knew in its best Ages; a *Christianity* never taught by *Christ* nor his *Apostles:* But for S. *Augustin*, I do not find that Dr. *St.* thinks him in the least baffled in this Matter; but being a Learned and Ingenuous Man, he saith, *That he quitted the Argument from the Poetical Fables concerning* Jupiter; and reduced the Controversy to its true Point, about the *Idolatry* committed in the Worship of *Inferior Deities.* But what an Itch of Calumniating had seized *T. G.* when he could not hold from Paralleling Dr. *St.* with *Julian*, merely for giving an Account of the *State* of the *Controversy* about *Idolatry*, as it was managed by S. *Augustin*?

Defence, p. 94.

*R. P.* This leads us into another weighty Subject; *viz. On what Account the Fathers charged the Heathens with Idolatry.*

*P. D.* I grant it is so; and tends very much to the right Understanding the Nature of it. And what Account doth *T. G.* give of it?

*R. P.* I assure you, *T. G.* shews himself to be a Man very well versed in the *Fathers*, and seems to have them at his Fingers ends: Nay, he hath such great Plenty of them, that they serve him not only for *Freight*, but for *Ballast* too; filling his *Margin*, as well as his *Book*, with them:

them: And had he not ſtudied Brevity, he might have outdone the Dr. himſelf *in being Voluminous.* Dial. p. 347.

*P. D.* No doubt of it; if he had a Mind to produce all that the *Fathers* ſay on the ſubject of *Heathen Idolatry*; but let us pare off all impertinencies which tend only to amuſe and confound a Reader, and keep cloſe to our Subject. Tell me on what account *T. G.* ſaith, the *Fathers* did charge the *Heathens* with *Idolatry.*

*R. P.* I ſuppoſe it may be reduced to theſe following. (1.) *In worſhipping their Images for Gods.* (2.) *In worſhipping a Multitude of falſe Gods.* (3.) *In worſhipping the Creatures and not the Creator.* And as to every one of theſe he ſhews how falſe Dr. *St.*'s Parallel is of the *Heathen Idolatry*, and the *Worſhip* practiſed and allowed in our *Church.*

*P. D.* I pray begin with the *firſt* of theſe; and let us hear what account *T. G.* gives of the *Heathen Idolatry* in the *Worſhip of Images.*

*R. P. The Images*, he ſaith, *were erected to the Memory of dead Men, whom the People out of Flattery or Affection had placed in Heaven; but evil Spirits as it were incorporated themſelves in thoſe Images; and by working ſtrange Things about thoſe who worſhipp'd them, they gained the Reputation of Gods; and conſequently the Images were held to be Gods, and worſhipped as ſuch.* Dial. p. 330.

*P. D.* I am far from being ſatisfied with this Account of the *Heathen Idolatry* in the *Worſhip* of *Images.* For when a Man pretends to give an account of a thing, there are three Things he ought to regard; Firſt, that it be *Full.* Secondly, that it be *Clear* and *Diſtinct.* Thirdly, that it be *General.* But I ſhall ſhew you, that this Account fails in all thoſe Particulars, and withal that it doth not clear the *Image Worſhip of the* Roman *Church.*

(1.) That it is not *full*, becauſe it ſuppoſes all their *Idolatry* as to *Images* to lye in taking the *Images of Deified Men for Gods on the Account of the Preſence of Evil Spirits in them.* But I find another Reaſon alledged out of the *Fathers* againſt the *Worſhip* of *Images* by Dr. *St.* which *T. G.* takes no Notice at all of; *viz.* that *Image Worſhip* was *very unſuitable to the Divine Nature*, as well as *repugnant to the Will of God*; and although the latter Reaſon may ſeem to hold only for thoſe who received the *Scriptures*, yet the former doth extend to all Mankind. For he ſhews from the *Fathers*, that *Zeno* the *Stoick*, *Antiſthenes*, *Xenophon*, *Numa*, and others, condemned the *Worſhip* of *Images* on this account, *becauſe they were a diſparagement of the Divine Nature.* And for this, he produces the *Teſtimonies* of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Juſtin Martyr*, *Athenagoras*, *Origen*, *Lactantius*, and many others. Is this Account true, or falſe? if falſe, why is it not proved to be ſo? if true, why is it not allowed? Is this fair or honeſt Dealing, in pretending to anſwer, and not taking notice of the main Objections; or to give Account of the *Fathers* Opinions of this Matter, and to ſay not one word to all this? But it is one thing to write an *Anſwer* to a *Book*, and another to write a *Book* which muſt paſs for an *Anſwer.* Defence, p. 419, to p. 431.

(2.) This Account is not *clear and diſtinct.* For it doth not expreſs whether it were *Idolatry* or not, to *worſhip Images*, where there was no *Incorporation ſuppoſed of Evil Spirits*, nor doth it ſhew how it could be *Idolatry* on that Suppoſition. I do not deny, that there was ſuch an Opinion among the *Heathens*, that *Spirits might poſſeſs Images*, and be *incorporated* with them; but I ſay this was a *particular Opinion*, and not the *general Belief.* For *Hermes*, from whom S. *Auguſtin*, gives the moſt exact Account of this *Hypotheſis* (from the *Aſclepian Dialogue*) looks upon

De Civ. Dei l. 8. c. 23. C. 24. upon it *as a Divine and Peculiar Art of drawing invisible Spirits into Images in such a manner as to animate them; and thereby making Gods. Which,* he saith, *is the most wonderful of all Wonders, that it should be in Men's Power to make Gods.* Not by producing the *Divine Being*; but by so *uniting* it to the *Image*, as to make that a fit *Object* for *Divine Worship*. But you of the *Church* of *Rome* pretend to do as much as this comes to with *Five Words*; and somewhat more, for you pretend to *annihilate a Substance* which they did not: But as to the main Wonder, yours is of the *same Nature*, *viz.* so to *unite the Divinity to the Species of Bread and Wine, as to make them together a fit Object for Divine Worship*. And therefore *T. G.* doth not at all clear the *Nature* of *Idolatry*, as to *Images*, by such an *Hypothesis*, which doth justify the *Worship* of *Images* upon his own grounds. For this Principle being supposed, that *God* was *really incorporated in the Image*, it was as lawful for them to *Worship* that *Image*, as for you to *Worship* the *Host*. If you say, *those were Evil Spirits and not the True God*, that doth not clear the Matter. For we are not now disputing whether they were *good* or *bad Spirits* which were in those *Images*; but on what Account they were charged with *Idolatry* in the *Worship* of *Images*. If it were *for worshipping their Images as Gods on the account of* one *of their* Gods *being* incorporated *in the Image*, this I say, is no account at all on *T. G.*'s Principles; for then such an *Image* was as fit an Object of *Worship*, on their Supposition, as the *Adoration* of the *Host* is on yours. So that this is rather a clearing the *Worship* of *Images* from the *Charge* of *Idolatry* among the *Heathens*, than giving any Account of it: All the *Idolatry* in this Case lying in the Worship of *Evil Spirits*, and not in the *Worship* of *Images*.

(3.) This Account is not *general* as to the *Heathens*. For many and those the most Learned among them declared, *that they did not take their Images for Gods*; as Dr. *St.* proved in his *First Book*; not barely from the Testimonies of the *Heathens*, but from the *Fathers* too; which Passages he repeated and urged against *T. G.* in his *Defence*. And among others he produced the Testimony of *Eusebius* speaking of the *Heathens* in *general*, who saith, *they did not look on their Images as Gods*; and of him, *T. G.* saith, *that no Man understood the Heathens Principles better*. And yet after all this, *T. G.* hopes to have it pass for a good Account of the *Heathens Idolatry* as to *Images*, that they took their *Images* for *Gods*.

Def. p. 466. &c. Euseb. Præp. l. 4. c. 1. Dial. p. 293.

(4.) This Account doth not clear the Practice of your *Church* in the *Worship* of *Images*.

*R. P.* There I am sure you are mistaken. For do we take our Images for Gods? And *T. G.* well observes, *that when the Fathers spake against the Worship of Images, from their Vileness and Impotency; they did not found their Arguments meerly on the Matter of the Images, and the Art of the Artificers, but upon these two Conditions conjoyntly taken,* viz. *that they were held to be Gods, and yet were made of such Materials; whereas we do not believe our Images to be Gods, nor worship them as such, as the Heathens did. For the Council of* Trent *declares that it believes no Divinity in them, for which they ought to be worshipped.*

Dial. p. 335.

*P. D.* This is the utmost which can be said in your Defence; and to shew you how far this is from clearing your *Worship* of *Images*, I shall consider, (1.) The Force of the *Fathers* Arguments. (2.) The difference of the *Heathens* Opinions from *yours* as to the *Divinity* of *Images*. And if their Arguments be such as equally hold against your Practices;

ctiſes ; and your Anſwers do not really differ from theirs ; then the Parellel will hold good between your Idolatry and theirs in this Particular.

1. For the Force of the *Fathers* Arguments ; the thing to be conſidered is, whether they held only *in Conjunction with believing their Images to be Gods.* What Connexion was there between this *Hypotheſis*, and *the Diſparagement which Images did imply to the Divine Nature* ? For this was wholly on the account of *Repreſentation* ; (and this is the great Argument the *Fathers* inſiſt upon.) *The infinite diſtance between God and the Work of Men's hands ; the diſproportion that dull and ſenſeleſs matter, however Carved and Adorned, doth bear to a Divine Majeſty : That no Image of God ought to be worſhipped, but what is what he is*, i. e. *his Eternal Son ; the Light of Nature teaching Men that it was greater Purity of Worſhip, greater Reverence to the Deity, leſs Danger of Error to Mankind, to worſhip God without an Image* ; are all Arguments uſed and preſſed by the *Fathers* againſt the Worſhip of Images ; which have their full Strength and Force, ſuppoſing nothing were intended beyond bare Repreſentation. What think you of the *Chriſtian Church* condemning the *Carpocratians* for worſhipping an *Image* of *Chriſt* ? Did they believe *Chriſt incorporated* in that *Image* too ? Or did *Epiphanius* believe him to be ſo in the *Image* on the *Veil*, or the *Council* of *Elvira* in the *Pictures* upon *Walls* ? By all which we ſee what Numbers of Arguments the *Fathers* uſed againſt the *Worſhip* of *Images*, which have no relation at all to the believing their *Images* to be *Gods*. Beſides, ſeveral other Arguments they uſed which would loſe their Force upon this Suppoſition ; as thoſe taken from the *meanneſs* of *ſubjecting our ſelves to vile and ſenſeleſs Images* ; and all the Enforcements drawn from the *Matter* and *Form* of them ; which would have no great Strength if this had been the general Belief of the *Heathens*, that the *God whom they worſhipped was incorporated in the Image* : And therefore why might not he be worſhipped thereby, as well as *God incarnate in human Nature*, notwithſtanding all the Vileneſs and Contemptibleneſs of our Fleſh ?

2. As to the difference between them and you about the *Divinity* of *Images*, I do grant, that your *Church* doth in terms declare againſt it. And ſo in probability would a *Council* of the *Wiſer Heathens* have done ; as appears by the Teſtimonies of *Celſus*, *Julian*, *Maximus Tyrius*, and many others. But when Men attribute ſuch *divine Effects*, as *Miraculous Cures* to *Images*, what can they believe but there is ſome *Divinity* either in or about them ? And when this is aſſigned as the *Reaſon* of the *Worſhip* of ſuch an *Image*, as at *Loretto*, or *Mointague*, or elſewhere ; and of the mighty Reſort thither on that account ; what is this but to believe ſuch *Divinity* to be in or about them ? which doth inhance the People's Devotion to them. And this was the general perſwaſion of the Heathens ; not, that there was an *Hypoſtatical Union* between the *Deity* and the *Image* by *Incorporation* : But that there was a *virtual* and *powerful Preſence* of the *Deity* in and about the *Image* by reaſon of its *Dedication.* And upon this Account, of a more peculiar *Preſence* of the *Deity* after *Conſecration*, and becauſe *Divine Worſhip was given to them*, it was, that the *Heathen Images* were called *Gods.* According to *Minucius* his account of the *Image-God* ; *Quando igitur hic naſcitur ? ecce funditur, fabricatur, ſcalpitur ; nondum Deus eſt : Ecce plumbatur, conſtruitur, erigitur ; nec adhuc Deus eſt : Ecce ornatur, conſecratur, oratur ; tunc poſtremo Deus eſt, cum homo illum voluit & dedicavit.* From which it appears, it was ſolemn Minuc. p. 26.

lemn *Dedication* and *divine Worſhip* which made the *Heathen Images* to be looked on as *Gods*. And on theſe Accounts the *Scripture* as well as *Fathers* call the *Heathen Idols* by the Name of *Gods*, in the places produced by *T. G.* As, when they are ſaid *to be molten Gods*, Lev. 19. 4. *And the Gods of the Nations are Idols*, Iſa. 44. 16, 17, &c. Where St. *Hierom* obſerves, *that the reſidue thereof is made a God, when the Maker worſhips what he has made; and begs for help from the work of his own hands.* And in this Senſe I grant the *Heathens* did make their Images *Gods*; and ſo do all thoſe who give *Divine Worſhip* to them.

Dial. p. 336. Hier. in If. 44. l. 12.

*R. P.* But Dr. *St.* ſeems to ſay, *that there never were any ſuch Fools in the World who worſhipped their Images as Gods*: Which *T. G.* proves abundantly from plain and expreſs Words of *Scripture*.

Dial. p. 336.

*P. D.* By the very ſame I have mentioned already: And which in the former Senſe Dr. *St.* never denied. All that he ſaith, is this, *As though there ever had been ſuch Fools in the World, to ſay there was no other God beſides their Images*: And as I remember he quotes *Maimonides*, ſaying there were none ſuch. But if *T. G.* can find out ſuch *Fools* in the world, by my conſent he ſhall have the *begging* of them.

Defence, p. 541. P. 724.

*R. P.* T. G. *grants there were ſome of the wiſer Heathens, who did not worſhip their Images as Gods, but the Deities repreſented by them: Againſt theſe the Fathers prove at large, that they were but Men whom they commonly worſhipped, and ſome of the worſt of Men.*

Dial. p. 340.

*P. D.* Wherein did the *Nature* of this *Idolatry* lye? In worſhipping *bad* Men inſtead of *good*? or in giving *Divine Worſhip* to *any Men*?

*R. P.* You are ſo troubleſome, that you will not let a Man ſhew his Skill in the *Fathers*, but you interrupt him with ſuch idle Queſtions.

*P. D.* I have a mind to bring you to our Buſineſs; for nothing is more eaſy than to tell long Stories of the *Heathen Idolatries*, out of the *Fathers*. I muſt preſs you again to tell me, wherein the *Nature* of this *Idolatry* conſiſted.

*R. P.* I ſhall deſire you as you are a Lover of Truth, to anſwer me ingenuouſly but this one Queſtion, which I take to be very Material towards the true underſtanding the *Nature* of *Idolatry*, viz. *Whether you do not think that the Heathens, at leaſt the generality of them, did not acknowledge and worſhip more Gods than one*?

Dial. p. 398, 399.

*P. D.* I will anſwer you as freely as you can deſire, provided you anſwer me another Queſtion which I take to be as Material, *viz.* Whether the *Generality* of the *Heathens* did not worſhip *Deified Men*?

*R. P.* What need you ask that, when I have told you already, T. G. *takes a great deal of pains to prove it from many Teſtimonies of the Fathers*? As I was about to have ſhewed when you interrupted me; *becauſe the Places of their Birth were known, and their Sepulchres extant*, &c.

Dial. p. 340, to 343.

*P. D.* I pray remember this; and now ask what Queſtions you pleaſe.

*R. P.* I ſee you have no mind to anſwer: But *T. G.* proves *that the Generality of the Heathens did believe them whom they publickly worſhipped, to be Truly and Properly Gods, and not only in Name, or by way of Participation.*

*P. D.* But have you forgotten already, what you ſo lately told me, that *T. G.* proved *that the generality of the Heathens did worſhip Deified-Men*?

Dial. p. 403, 406.

*men ? and that these were their Gods* ; viz. Jupiter, Saturn, Juno, Æsculapius, *&c.* I pray consider, were these their *Gods* or not ?

*R. P.* Doubtless they were ; *for* T. G. *hath plainly demonstrated it from the Fathers.*

*P. D.* And were those who were only *Deified-men, truly and properly Gods, and not by way of Participation* ?

*R. P.* I confess you stagger me, surely *T. G.* did not lay these two Assertions together , *that the Heathen Gods were originally Men, and yet were truly and properly Gods* : But he proves this latter Assertion, that I am sure of.

*P. D.* So you were but just now of the former ; however these contradict each other ; let us hear his Proofs of this latter, which is not so true as the former.

*R. P. First, The whole Christian World till Dr.* St. *did ever condemn the Heathens of Polytheism.* Dial. p. 406.

*P. D.* And so doth he too. Only he doth not believe *Deified-men* to be *independent Deities.* They were *Gods*, as they gave them not barely the *Name* and *Title* of *Gods* ; but as they supposed them *to be admitted into some share in administring the Affairs of the World* ; *and had therefore Divine Worship given unto them.*

*R. P. Secondly, The Heathens accused the Christians of Atheism, because they denied them to be Gods who were publickly worshipped.*

*P. D.* The Heathens did not believe there was any such *God* who disallowed the *worship of any other Gods besides him* ; and therefore when they found the *Christians* utterly reject their *worship*, they charged them with *Atheism.* But is not this an admirable way of reasoning, from the *Heathens* Objections against the *Christians* ? Might he not prove as well that the *Christans God had Asses Ears, that they eat Children, that they had promiscuous Conjunctions*, &c. for all these were objected by the Heathens, as well as *Atheism* ? And *Athenagoras* whom *T. G.* cites, shews what kind of *Gods* those were, whom the *Christians* rejected, in the very beginning of his *Apology*, such as *Hector, Helena, Agamemnon, Erictheus*, &c. and because the *Christians* rejected such Deities, they were accused of *Atheism* ; but doth this prove *Hector*, and *Agamemnon* to have been *Original* and *Independent Gods* ?

*R. P. Thirdly, They persecuted the Christians to death, and they willingly suffered it, for maintaining there was but one only true God, who deserved Divine Honour to be given to him.* Dial. p. 407.

*P. D.* Very true. Because they thought it unlawful to give *Divine Worship* to any *Creature* whatsoever. But did not the *Heathens* require *Divine Worship* to be given to *Deified-men* ?

*R. P. Fourthly they erected Temples, instituted Priests, and appointed Sacrifices to be offered to them.*

*P. D.* That is , they gave them *Divine Worship* ; and what then ? they did so to *Deified-men*, saith *T. G.*

*R. P. Fifthly, The Fathers bring infinite Arguments to prove that those whom the Heathens called Gods, were not really and truly Gods ; which had been a superfluous Labour, if the Heathens had not believed as well as called them Gods.*

*P. D.* And did not the same *Fathers* bring *infinite Arguments* to prove that these *Gods were but men* ? Their design was to shew that nothing but what was truly and essentially *God*, could deserve *Divine Worship* ; which

which their *vulgar Gods* were so far from being, that they were *meer Men*, and some of the worst too.

*R. P. Sixthly, Many of those who wrote against the Heathens had been such themselves; and therefore would not charge them with more than they were guilty of in this matter.*

*P. D.* Those were the very Men *T. G.* cited *to prove their Gods had been Men, and had Fathers and Mothers, and Uncles and Aunts, as other Mortals have.*

Dial. p. 428. *R. P. Seventhly, The Devils perswaded most of the Heathens that they were Gods, as St.* Augustin *saith, by their fallacious Signs and Predictions.*

De Civ. Dei l. 8. c. 22. *P. D.* St. *Augustin* speaks of their *Dominion over Mankind by reason of Idolatry*; which might have been, although the *Heathens* had only worshipped *Deified men*; but I grant, that the *Heathens* did give *divine Worship to Dæmons* too; whom some believed to be *Intercessors between the Gods and Men; carrying up our Prayers to them, and bringing down their help to us*; as he there expresseth it; and others thought them to be *Gods*, i. e. *a superior kind of Spirits*; however all agreed in giving *divine Honour* to them. But those who believed them to be *Gods*, i. e. *of a higher rank than the subservient Dæmons*, did not suppose them to be *self-existent and independent Deities*, but to have received their Being by Participation from *God*; and supposing them good, St. *Augustin* thinks their Notion of them not much different from what *Christians* have of *Angels*: And that it was a controversy about a Name, *whether they be called Gods or not*; but he is far from thinking it so, *whether Divine Worship were to be given to them?* For this he utterly denies, it being inconsistent with the *Christian Religion*, as he proves in the beginning of his Tenth Book. From whence it appears, that the Controversy was not about the *Name of Gods*; but about giving *Divine Worship to any Creature.* For St. *Augustin* would allow them to call them *Gods*, if they reserved *Divine Worship* as *peculiar* to *God*; but if they did give this to them, it was no excuse to call them *Angels*, or *inferior Gods*; as the *Platonists* did. And when he saith, *the Devils had perswaded the greatest part of Mankind by their lying Wonders that they were Gods*: His meaning is no more than that they were *good Spirits*; which he saith, *Apuleius, and others, observing them more narrowly, found they were not, but a sort of malicious and deceitful Beings*; *notwithstanding which*, he saith, *these agreed with the rest in giving Divine Worship to them.* So that whatever men do give *Divine Worship* to, that they do make a *God* of, whatsoever Notion they have of its *Original*, and receiving Being from another.

De Civ. Dei, l. 9. c. 23. L. 10. c. 1.

*R. P. Eighthly, The wisest of the Heathens not only concurred with the vulgar in the external practice of worshipping many Gods, but looked on it as a point of State-policy, not to let the People know that they were no Gods whom they worshipped.*

*P. D.* And what then I beseech you? They were rather willing to maintain *Idolatry*, than to hazard the disturbance of *Government*; therefore the *Gods* whom they worshipped were *truly and properly Gods.* All that follows from hence is, that there were many Follies and Superstitions among the People, which they thought better to let them alone in, than to run the hazard of all by a Change; that the *Poets*, and *Painters*, and *Statuaries* had tainted the *Religion* of the *Vulgar* with false and unworthy Notions of their *Gods*; and would in spite of Laws represent their *Gods* in the publick Sports doing things unfitting for Men to do or see; that although they thought it were much better to have these

Things

Things redreſſed, yet they had ſo much greater Regard to the *ſafety* of the *Government* than to the *Honour* of *Religion*, that they choſe rather to let Things ſtand as they found them; and to joyn with the People in the ſame *Acts* of *publick Worſhip*, retaining their Opinions to themſelves. But we ſhall have occaſion to diſcourſe of theſe *wiſer Men* afterwards.

*R. P.* I have one thing yet more to ſay, which I am ſure *ought and will weigh with you more than all the reſt.* Dial. p. 411.

*P. D.* So it will, if it weighs any thing at all.

*R. P. It is, that God himſelf forbids the* Jews *to have any other Gods beſides him: And yet he doth not forbid the Name of Gods to be given both to Angels and Men.*

*P. D.* Is this the weighty Obſervation? The Bit reſerved to cloſe up the Stomach with? God doth allow, I grant, the Name of *Gods* to be given to *Creatures*; but where doth he allow *Divine Worſhip Internal* or *External* to be given to any other *Being* beſides himſelf? Whether *Angels*, or *Stars*, or *Elements*, or whatſoever Creature it be, to give that *Worſhip* to it, which is due only to *God*, is to make *other Gods beſides him*, and this I thought had been agreed on all ſides.

*R. P. If they give Divine Worſhip to any one of theſe as an abſolute Deity*, as *T. G.* well obſerves; *and not if they refer the worſhip they give to them to the true God.* Dial. p. 412.

*P. D.* What means *the giving divine Worſhip as to an abſolute Deity?* Is it to ſuppoſe that which they worſhip *to be truly and properly God*, as *T. G.* ſaith? That is to ſuppoſe it *not to be a Creature.* And upon this ground thoſe who ſuppoſed the *Spirits*, or *Stars*, or *Elements* to be *Creatures*, could not be guilty of *Idolatry* in the *Worſhip* of them: And ſo the greateſt part of the *Heathen World* will be excuſed from it. Or is it *to give Divine Worſhip to the Creatures without any reſpect to God the Maker of the World, and of all things in it?* But then either they did at that time believe him to be the *Maker of thoſe Beings*, or they did not: If they did, either they worſhipped them as *created*, or as *uncreated Beings*; if as *created Beings*, how could they *wholly paſs by the Creator*? if as *uncreated*, how could they at the ſame time believe them to be *created* by him?

*R. P. T. G.* was aware of this, for he puts the queſtion concerning the Heathens, *how thoſe who acknowledged one Supreme Being, could think any others to be truly and properly Gods beſides him?* And he reſolves it thus, *that the generality of the Heathens had no clear and diſtinct Notion of one Supreme Being; but only the Wiſer Philoſophers.* Dial. p. 419.

*P. D.* By this anſwer, none but the *dull and ſtupid Vulgar* could be guilty of *Idolatry*, ſuch who believed (if any did) *there were no other Gods beſides their Images*; or if there were, they never conſidered more, than that they were all called *Gods* alike, and they knew no Diſtinction between *one Chief and the reſt*: But if they happened to ſuppoſe *one Supreme* and the others *made by him*, as I have ſhewed from *Tertullian* they generally did, then they are free from *Idolatry* in all Acts of *Worſhip* performed with that Opinion. For if *Idolatry* doth ſuppoſe a Belief of *more Gods than one truly and properly ſo called*, then all thoſe who did own and acknowledge *one firſt Cauſe* from whence all other Beings were derived, could not be guilty of it, and conſequently all thoſe who had the true Knowledge of *God* could not commit *Idolatry*, becauſe they could not at the ſame time believe but *One True God, and many true Gods.*

And if the true Notion of *Idolatry* doth consist *in believing and worshipping many Gods truly and properly so called*; then let us see how many of the *Heathens* will stand clear from the Guilt of it.

(1.) All those who worshipped *Deified Men*, and believed them to be such, although they gave them the *Worship proper to true Gods*. For as long as they did not think them to be such, it could not be *real Idolatry*: And so *Cicero*, *Varro*, and *Seneca*, and the rest of the *wise Statesmen* will be excused.

(2.) All those who believed *Inferior Gods* having their first Being from one Supreme; as the ancient *Poets*, *Platonists*, and many others.

(3.) All those who worshipped the *parts* of the World with respect *to one God*, as the *Stoicks* and others.

(4.) All those who opposed *Christianity* upon this ground, *that although there were but one supreme God, yet others might receive Divine Worship together with him*: And upon this Principle the most bitter Enemies of Christianity disputed, *viz. Celsus*, *Porphyrius*, *Hierocles*, *Julian*, *Maximus*, *Symmachus*, and others. And to own it not to be *Idolatry*, to give *Divine Worship* to Created Beings, supposing them not to be owned to be *truly and properly Gods*, is in plain Terms to give up the Cause of *Christianity* against *Heathen Idolatry*. And this I insist upon as the main Argument in this Matter, and desire you or *T. G.* or any one else to answer it. Dr. *St.* hath made it evident from the Testimonies of *Celsus*, *Julian*, and the Modern *Platonists*, that the Dispute about *Idolatry*, between them and the *Christians* was not, whether there were *only one God truly and properly so called*, *and others only by participation from him*; for this they yielded. But the Question was, Whether upon that Supposition that they were *inferior and subservient Gods*, they might not have *Divine Worship* given to them in a degree suitable to their Excellencies? And upon this Point the Hinge of the Controversie turned. Either the *Christians* were right in condemning such Worship for *Idolatry*, or not? If not, the Cause of *Christianity* is given up to *Celsus* and *Julian*: If they were in the right, then *Idolatry* doth not lie *in believing and worshipping many Gods properly and truly so called*; but in *giving Divine Worship to any Creature whatsoever*. And why did not *T. G.* answer to this, which was the most material Point of all others? But run out into long Discourses of the *Ignorance of the vulgar Heathen* (which no Man doubts any more than the *Ignorance of vulgar Papists*, although I hope not to the same Degree) *concerning the true God*. And yet we could tell him of another sort of *Statesmen*, who love to keep the People in *Ignorance*, lest they should by the help of the Scriptures see too far into these Matters. And some of your own Church have told us, *That they could find no difference between the common Peoples Opinion of Saints, and what the Heathens had of their Gods*. And thus the Parallel holds good still. But the common People, though more gross in their Apprehensions, and do commit greater Follies in their Practices, may yet be safer in their Ignorance, than those who ought to inform them better. But when we enquire *what is lawful*, we must not run to the Practices or Opinions of the *Vulgar*, as *T. G.* doth here; but to the State of the *Case*, as it was managed by those who best understood it. And they did not put it upon that Issue, *whether it were lawful to worship many independent Deities*; but *whether it were lawful to give Divine Worship to any created Beings, on the account of that Power and Authority which God had put into their hands?*

Defence, p. 81, to 102.

And if this were not *Idolatry*, *Celsus* and *Julian* thought *Heathenism* justified, and the Doctrine of *Christianity* overthrown; and so did *Origen*, S. *Cyril*, and S. *Augustin* too.

(5.) The Modern *Idolaters* will be excused too, if the Nature of *Idolatry* doth consist in *a Multitude of independent Deities*, or *of Gods truly and properly so called:* For Dr. *St.* hath proved abundantly, that the *Eastern*, *Western*, *Southern* and *Northern Nations*, which are, or have been charged with *Idolatry* by the *Roman Church*, *do own one Supreme God, and others as inferior Deities.* And this he chiefly proves from the *Testimonies* of those of the *Roman* Church, who have been sent as *Missioners* to convert them from their *Idolatry.* And what saith *T. G.* to that?

*R. P. Truly he had forgotten to speak to it, but a Friend of his putting him in mind of it, he hath added something by way of Appendix about it; to shew how unnecessary it was to speak to it.*

*P. D.* All in good time: But it was well *the Printer informed him of two or three vacant Leaves too*, or else we might have wanted those rare Observations. But *why so unnecessary to answer an Argument of that Consequence?* Which to my apprehension hath effectually overthrown this *Hypothesis* of *T. G. That Idolatry lies in the Esteem and Worship of many Gods truly and properly so called:* For if that were the general Supposition that *Idolaters* went upon, that there was *one Supreme, and many inferior Deities*, as Dr. *St.* hath proved of the * *Arabians*, † *Persians*, * *Brachmans*, (who are shewed to have no other † Esteem of the *Inferior Deities* than you have of your *Saints*, and that they give only a *relative Worship* to them, and to their *Images*) and of the very * *Tartars* and *West-Indians* †, and * *Northern Idolaters*; how then can *T. G.* hope to make it appear to any Man of common Sense, that the Nature of *Idolatry* lies in the *worshipping many independent Gods*? If *T. G.* were sent upon a *Mission* to them, I would fain know by what Arguments he could convince any of these of *Idolatry*? *T. G.* charges them with *Idolatry* for *worshipping many Gods truly and properly so called:* They deny it, and say *they worship only one Supreme, and others in subordination to him*; what hath *T. G.* further to say? Will he tell them, he knows better what they do, than they do themselves? I say therefore it is impossible upon *T. G's* Principles, to convince these *Heathens* of *Idolatry.* But there is another thing, I think, very material in this Discourse concerning the *Modern Idolaters*, which is, *T. G.* insinuates, *that although some few of the wiser sort of Heathens might understand the difference between the Supreme God and inferior Deities, yet the generality of the People did not; and so might easily worship many Gods properly and truly so called:* Whereas by this Discourse it appears that the difference between the *supreme* and *inferior Deities*, was a thing known and received among the most rude and barbarous Nations. And it is no great Civility towards the *Greeks* and *Romans*, to imagine them to be more *sottish Idolaters* than the *Tartars* and *West-Indians.* I will confess freely to you, that I think there was not a more absurd and impious Scheme of *Divinity* extant in the most barbarous Parts of the World, that are come to our knowledge, than the *Poetical Theology* of the *Greeks* and *Romans*, if it be understood literally; and therefore the common People who had the *Poets* in mighty Esteem, lay under great Disadvantages; but yet, the *Poetical Fables* being rejected by their *Laws*, as well as by their *wise Men*, and the *Poets* themselves confessing *one supreme God*, but above all, *the natural sense of*

* Defence p. 103. † p. 109. * p. 114. † p. 122, 123. * p. 141. † p. 143. * p. 157.

Dial. p. 419, 421.

*Conscience*, did keep up the Notion of *one God* among the *People*, *who was Lord over all*; insomuch that upon any solemn Occasions they made
Lact. l. 1. c. 3, 5. their Appeal to him, as the Fathers observe. *Lactantius* saith, *not only the Wise, but all sorts of People confessed the Unity of God; even those who seemed to assert the Multiplicity of Gods* truly and properly so called; for these are his Words, *Quod quia intelligunt isti assertores Deorum; ita eos præesse singulis rebus ac partibus dicunt, ut tantum unus sit Rector eximius. Jam ergo cæteri non Dij erunt, sed satellites ac ministri; quos ille unus maximus, & potens omnium officiis his præfecit, ut ipsi ejus imperio ac nutibus serviant.* Let *T. G.* construe this to the Confusion of his *Hypothesis*, that the *Heathen Idolatry* lay in the Worship of many *Gods truly and properly so called*; when even *Lactantius* saith the contrary so expressly: Those cannot be *Gods truly and properly so called*, who are under the Command of another; and this is *Lactantius* his own Argument, *Ergo Dij non sunt quos parere uni maximo Deo necessitas cogit. And this Truth*, he saith, *of the Unity of God is so plain, that no Man can be so blind not*
c. 5, 7. *to discover so clear a light.* *Seneca* in his Exhortations quoted by *Lactantius*, calls the *inferior Gods the Servants to the Supreme*; *Ministros Regni sui Deos genuit*: And the difference between them and the Holy *Angels* he places in this, *that these would not be called Gods, nor be worshipped as Gods.* The former we see St. *Augustin* makes nothing of; so that the true Ground why the *Heathens* attributed *Divinity* to them, was because they gave to them *Divine Worship*, which the *Christians* utterly refused. The same *Lactantius* saith in general of the *Romans*, *That in any great*
L. 2. c. 1. *Distress they made their Application to the Supreme God, and prayed to him, and expected help from him, and begg'd Relief from others* per ejus Divinum atq; unicum Numen; and these Beggars surely were some of the common sort of People: From whence it follows, that the generality of the *Heathen*, even among the *Romans*, did not esteem and worship *many Gods properly so called.*

*R. P.* But methinks, you seem to have forgotten T. G.'s *Appendix* about the *Modern Idolatry*, as well as he had *to write about it, till he was put in mind by a Friend.*

*P. D.* I am not very apt to believe *T. G.* could forget so material a part of the Doctor's Book: But there was some other Reason for passing it over, which it is not hard to conjecture. But I thank you for putting me to ask you, *why he thought it so unnecessary to speak to it.*

R. P. *First, because the Doctor reduces their Worship to one of these two Principles, either that God hath committed the Government of the World to inferior Deities; or that God is the Soul of the World: Now* T. G. *having proved that those who do hold the latter Principle, are guilty of Idolatry; and those who hold the former, of the exterior Profession of it, in concurring with the Vulgar in the external Practice of their Idolatry, it would have been but* actum agere, *to repeat the same things over again.*

*P. D.* This is scarce a tolerable Shift; for the great force of that Discourse lay in two Things; (1.) The almost *universal Consent* of *Idolaters*, that there was *one supreme God*, against *T. G.*'s *Hypothesis* of *many Gods truly and properly so called.* (2.) That all these were charged with *Idolatry* by the *Roman* Church; and therefore according to the sense of that, *Idolatry* could not lie *in worshipping many independent and absolute Deities.* But the prettiest Shift, is, *that he had condemned the Platonists for the exterior Practice of Idolatry, in concurring with the Vulgar*, and therefore he need not speak to *whole Nations*, who agreed in that

that *Principle* of *Worſhip*, and yet are charged with *Idolatry*. If I were given to quoting ends of *Verſes*, I would cry, *Riſum teneatis amici*.

*R. P. Secondly, the Force of the Parallel lies in Citations.*

*P. D.* And what then? ought he not to examine and diſprove them?

*R. P.* No ſuch Matter; he hath found out a far better way than that; he proves *that Dr.* St. *hath forfeited all Right of being believed in things of that kind.*

*P. D.* Commend me to *T. G.* for ſhifting. This is really the notableſt Trick I ever met with. He finds abundance of *Authors* quoted, both new and old, to prove ſomething he doth not like. What ſhould he do? Muſt he ſearch and examine them one by one? No, that is intolerable; And how if they prove true? Therefore the only way is to ſay, *he hath loſt all Credit in his Citations.* Which is as much as to ſay, he deſerves to ſtand in the Pillory for *ſuborning Witneſſes*, and why ſhould he be credited in any thing he ſaith? But this is a very *high Accuſation*, and *T. G.* in *Common Juſtice* is bound to prove it, or elſe he deſerves the ſame *Infamy* himſelf.

*R. P.* Yes, he proves it, *by his notorious miſrepreſenting and corrupting the Fathers.*

*P. D.* I think I have ſufficiently cleared the Doctor's *Integrity* and *Faithfulneſs* therein; but I am ſure you cannot ſo well clear *T. G.* from *bearing Falſe Witneſs againſt his Brother.*

*R. P.* But he gives one Inſtance in this Caſe, viz. *A Teſtimony of* Trigautius, *wherein he tranſlates*, Certum Triadis modum inducit quo tres Deos in unum deinde Numen coaleſcere fabulatur. *They worſhip the Trinity after a certain manner, with an Image having three Heads, and one Body.* T. G. ſaith, *an ordinary Reader will here find neither Head nor Foot.*

*P. D.* That is very ſtrange, when there are three. But muſt *T. G.*'s Quibble deſtroy all Dr. *St*'s Credit? Any one that reads *Trigautius* will find he exactly expreſſed his Senſe: But our *Dionyſius* will make him conſtrue Word for Word, or elſe he muſt be ſet in the Pillory, for ſuborning Teſtimonies. Methinks this ſavours a little too much of *Dionyſius* indeed.

*R P.* But he charges him more with another *Teſtimony* of *Trigautius*, where he *leaves out the Emphatical Words which ſhew the difference between the Worſhip which the* Chineſes *give to* Confutius, *and to the Tutelar Spirits. For firſt, he omits the Ceremony of the Magiſtrates taking the Oath before the Tutelar Spirits: Then he leaves out what* Trigautius *affirms, That the Worſhip was not the ſame.* (3.) He omits *Nam* and *Divinam*; *which ſhew the Reaſon of the difference to be the Divine Power which they believ'd to be in the Tutelar Spirits.*

*P. D.* And what if *T. G.* be miſtaken as to every one of theſe? ſhall we not applaud him for a Man of wonderful Integrity, and moſt commendable Ingenuity? (1.) Dr. *St.* doth not omit *the Ceremony of the Magiſtrates taking their Oath to or before theſe Tutelar Spirits*; for he ſaith expreſly, that the *Mandarines* are *to ſwear in the Temple of the Tutelar Spirit when they enter into their Office*: And he particularly inſiſts upon it, as one of the Inſtances of the Allowances the *Jeſuits* gave to their *Converts* to go and perform all *External Acts of Adoration* in the *Temple* of the *Tutelar Spirits*, provided they directed all thoſe *Acts* to a Defence, p. 132.

*Crucifix*

*Crucifix* which they held in their Hands, or conveyed secretly among the Flowers of the Altar. (2.) He distinguishes the *Worship* of *Confutius* from that of the *Tutelar Spirits*. For he saith in that very place, *that they make no Prayers to him, neither seek, nor hope for any thing from him; but that they acknowledge the Tutelar Spirits to have power to reward and punish.* Is not this enough to shew the difference of their *Worship* to any Men of Common Sense? (3.) Is not a *Power to reward and punish* in the *Tutelar Spirits* set down by Dr. *St.* out of *Trigautius*? And to what end should he then leave out *Nam* and *Divinam*, but that he thought them needless when the Sense was expressed? But the *Birchen Scepter* would be of little use, unless *Dionysius* shewed his *Authority* upon such Occasions. Judge you now whether upon the account of such pitiful Cavils, *Dr.* St. *hath forfeited his Right of being believed in his Citations.*

P. 130.

*R. P.* T. G. gives a Third Reason, viz. *because it appears from his own Citations, that these Modern Idolaters either worshipped a False God for the True one; or False Gods together with the True one, if they worshipped him at all.*

*P. D.* This can be no Reason at all; for Dr. *St.*'s Design was to shew that *Inferior Deities were False Gods*; and that it was *Idolatry* to give *Divine Worship* to *Creatures*, although Men did acknowledge *one supreme God.* But unless *T. G.* can prove these *False Gods* to have been *Gods truly and properly so called*; *i. e.* Absolute and Independent Deities, his *Hypothesis* is utterly overthrown by this Discourse of Dr. *St.* which was the true Reason he had no mind to meddle with it.

*R. P.* Lastly, *It is not credible*, he saith, *that the Cardinals* de propaganda Fide, *with the full Consent of the Pope, should make such Decrees about Idolatrous Acts, as should condemn the giving External Acts of Worship to Saints and Images as Idolatrous.*

*P. D.* Dr. *St.* punctually produced the *Resolution* made by the *Cardinals* about the *Worship* of *Confutius*, and the performance of *External Acts of Idolatry* in the *Temple* of the *Tutelar Spirits*, by the *Jesuits Converts* in *China.* He names the *Date*, the *Place* of *Printing* it, and saith *the Copy he had seen* was attested by a *Publick Notary:* Nay, he directs *T. G.* where he might see not only the *Decree*, but an *Explication* of it. And after all, *is not this Credible?*

Defence, *p.* 136.

*R. P. Dr.* St *sets down the Resolutions, and doth not let us know what the* Queries *were.*

*P. D.* He thought those might be easily understood by the *Case*; viz. about performing the *same External Acts of Worship with Idolaters, but with a different Intention*: *i e.* The *Mandarins* were permitted by the *Jesuits* to go into the *Temple* of *Tutelar Spirits*, and to use all the *External Acts* of *Adoration* which others used, provided they directed them to the *Crucifix* and not to the *Idol*; which the *Cardinals* declare to be utterly unlawful, notwithstanding this *Intention.* From whence Dr. *St.* observed, (1.) That they called the *Worship* of the *Tutelar Spirits Idolatry*, although they looked on them only as *inferior Deities*; and consequently *Idolatry* doth not consist in worshipping many *Absolute and Independent Gods*, or *truly and properly so called.* (2.) That *Inferior Worship* on the account of *Created Excellency*, is *unlawful*, when it appears to be *Religious.* This he proved from their condemning the *Worship* of *Confutius*, which the *Jesuits* allowed. And *T G.* is so much mistaken in thinking

ing

ing that Dr. *St.* had any design to corrupt the *Testimony* of *Trigautius* by confounding the *Worship* of *Confutius* and the *Tutelar Spirits*, that his Argument is the stronger for the distinction between them. For although *no Prayers be made to* Confutius, *no Divine Power be supposed to be in him* as in the *Tutelar Spirits*, yet because he had a *Temple* in every *City*, with his *Image* in it; and all other *External Rites of Adoration used*, as *Genuflections*, *Wax-Candles*, *Incense* and *Oblations*; (such as your *Church* useth to *Images* without *Prayers*) yet these are condemned as *Idolatrous*. And although the *Cardinals* might not then reflect on the Consequence of this Resolution, as to their own Practices, yet I cannot but admire at the *Wisdom* of that *Providence* which once directed *Caiaphas* to speak a great *Truth* beside his *Intention*, that so over-ruled the *Congregation* of *Cardinals* to condemn their own *Idolatry* under the Name of *Confutius*. For if the using those *External Acts* of *Adoration* towards the *Image* of *Confutius* be *Idolatry*, why shall it not be so where *Prayers* are added, as they are in your *Church* to the *Images* set up in your *Churches*? Let *T. G.* tell me wherein the *Nature* of that *Idolatry* lay, which consisted in *External Acts* of *Adoration*, without any Opinion of *Confutius* being a *God truly and properly so called*. (3.) That *External Acts* are capable of *Idolatry*, however the *Intention* of the Mind be directed. For although the *Cardinals* believed the *Crucifix* to be a *proper Object of Divine Worship*, yet they condemned those *Acts* as *Idolatrous* which were directed to it in the *Temple* of the *Tutelar Spirits*. And upon the whole Matter, I think no Impartial Reader will believe that *T. G.* hath said any thing to purpose upon this Matter, and that he had better left those few Leaves still vacant, than have filled them with such an insignificant *Postscript*; and he hath no reason to thank his *Friend for putting him* upon laying open so much the *Weakness* of his *Cause*. For from hence it farther appears that the *Modern Idolaters* will likewise be excused, if the Nature of *Idolatry* doth consist, as *T. G.* saith, in *worshipping many Gods, truly and properly so called*.

*R. P.* But you are mistaken, if you think *T. G.* placeth the *Nature* of *Idolatry* wholly in this, for he saith, *that the Heathens were guilty of Idolatry in worshiping Nature instead of God; either the several parts of the Universe, as Sun, Moon, and Stars*, &c. *understanding the Fire by* Jupiter, *the Air by* Juno, &c. *or the Soul of the World, as the* Stoicks *did*; *whereby the Heathens did, as* T. G. *often repeats it from* Vossius, Relicto Deo in Naturæ Veneratione consistere; *forsaking God, stay in the Worship of the Creatures: And for this he quotes* Athanasius, S. Augustine, *and* Athenagoras. Dial. p. 332, 343, 349, 413.

*P. D.* It is sufficient for Dr. *St.*'s Design, if the *Worship* of *Images*, and of *Intellectual Beings* under *one Supreme God*, were *Idolatry* among the *Heathens*, for then it must remain so among *Christians*; as well as Murther and Adultery are the same whereever they are found. But since you have proposed it, I shall consider with you how far the *Worship* of the *Creatures* in general is *Idolatry*. But I have some few Questions to ask you about this sort of *Idolatry*. (1.) Whether you think the *Heathens Idolatry* did lye in worshipping *meer Matter* as *God*? Or, (2.) In worshipping *God* as the *Soul* of the *World*, and the *several Parts* of it with *respect* to him? Or, (3.) In acknowledging a *Creator*, but *giving all the Worship to the Creatures*?

*R. P.* In all these, according to their several Opinions.

*P. D.* Do you really think any of them did worſhip *meer Matter*, without Life, Senſe, or Underſtanding, for *God*? For either they did believe ſome other *God*, or not: If they did, how is it poſſible they ſhould not worſhip that which could hear, and underſtand, and help them; and worſhip that which could do none of theſe? If they did not believe *any other God*, they were *Atheiſts* and not *Idolaters*. For are not thoſe *Atheiſts* who acknowledge *no other God but meer Matter*; i. e. *no God at all*? For ſo *Voſſius* himſelf ſaith, thoſe who held *meer Matter* to be *God*, *verbo Deum fatebantur, re negabant*: Did only ſeem to believe a *God* whom they really deny'd. *For what kind of God*, ſaith he, *was that which had neither Senſe nor Reaſon*?

Voſſ. de Idolol. l. 7. c. 5.

*R. P. It was Idolatry then to worſhip the Parts of the World with a reſpect to God as the* Soul *of it*; which as *T. G.* ſaith in his *Poſtſcript*, is *to make a Falſe God.*

*P. D.* There are two Things which deſerve to be conſidered as to this Matter. (1.) In what Senſe making *God* the *Soul of the World* is ſetting up a *Falſe God*? (2.) How far the *Gentiles* could be charged with *Idolatry*, who worſhipped the *Parts* of the World with reſpect to *God* as the *Soul* of it?

*R. P. Do not you think making God the Soul of the World is ſetting up a Falſe God?*

*P. D.* I pray tell me what you mean by the *Soul of the World.* For either you mean the natural *ſeries* of *Cauſes*, or the more ſubtile and active Parts of Matter diffuſed through the *Univerſe*, without *Mind* and *Underſtanding*: or you mean an *Intelligent Being*, which by *Wiſdom* and *Providence* orders and governs the World, but withal is ſo *united* to it, as the *Soul* is to the *Body*: If you mean the former, I ſay all ſuch who held it were really *Atheiſts*, and only differed in the way of ſpeaking from thoſe who worſhipped *meer Matter*: For let them call *God* the *Soul of the World* never ſo much, they mean no more than that there is no other *God* but the *Power* of *Nature*. If you mean an *Underſtanding Being Governing the World*, whoſe Eſſence is diſtinct from Matter, but yet is ſuppoſed to be ſo *united* to it as the *Soul* is to the *Body*, then I pray tell me in what Senſe you make him to be *a Falſe God*, and how it comes to be *Idolatry* to worſhip the Parts of the World with reſpect to him?

*R. P.* St. *Auguſtin* proves againſt *Varro*, *that God was not the Soul of the World, if there were any ſuch Thing, but the Creator and Maker of it*: *And he ſhews that this Opinion is attended with impious and irreligious Conſequences.*

Dial. p. 349.

*P. D.* I do not go about to defend the Opinion, but I hope I may ask, Wherein the *Idolatry* lay of worſhipping *one God* under this Notion, as he *animated* the *World*, and the *ſeveral Parts* of it?

*R. P. In worſhipping the ſeveral Parts of the World with Divine Worſhip*; *not with a reſpect to the Body, but to God as the Soul of it*; for therein *Aquinas* placeth their *Idolatry.*

Aq. c. Gentes l 3. c. 120.

*P. D. Is Relative Latria Idolatry*?

*R. P.* Why do you ask me ſuch an Impertinent Queſtion?

*P. D.* Nothing can be more pertinent, for this is *mere relative Latria.*

*R. P.* It was *Idolatry* in them, but yet not ſo in us when we worſhip the *Crucifix* with *reſpect to Chriſt.*

*P. D.* You

*P. D.* You may as well say, Lying with another Man's Wife was *Adultery* in them, but not in *You*. I pray shew the difference.

*R. P.* You would fain bring me back again to the *Worship* of *Images*; but you shall not. For I say, their *Idolatry lay in worshipping God, as united to the Parts of the World, and giving Divine Worship to them on that Account.*

*P. D.* Will you stand to this?

*R. P.* Why not?

*P. D.* Then I will prove *worshipping the Host* to be *Idolatry* on the same Grounds. For in both Cases there is a Supposition really false, but which being true, would justify the *Act* of *Worship*; and if notwithstanding that Supposition, that *God is the Soul of the World*, the *Worshipping* of *God* as so *united*, is *Idolatry*, then the Worship of the *Host*, notwithstanding the Supposition of Christ's Body being *united* to the *species*, is *Idolatry* too; they being both Acts of Adoration given to those Objects which in themselves deserve no Worship, but yet are adored upon such a Supposition, which being true, would justify the performance of them.

*R. P.* You are much mistaken in your Parallel. *For*, as *T. G.* well observed, *in the worship of the Host, the Act of Adoration is not formally terminated upon the Bread, supposing it to remain, but upon God: But we conceive the Bread not to be there at all; but in place thereof the only True and Eternal God. And whatever is taken for an Object of Worship, the Understanding must affirm (either truly or falsly) to be; but Catholicks, whether mistaken or not in the belief of* Transubstantiation, *do not in their Minds affirm the Bread to be, but not to be; because they believe it to be converted into the Body of Christ. But they who worshipped the Parts of the World, with a respect to God as the Soul of it, did however believe those to have a Real Being, and not to be turned into the Substance of God.* Cathol. no Idol. p. 327, &c. Dial. p. 432, 433.

*P. D.* All that this proves is, that you do not take *the Bread it self for God*; no more did they, who worshipped the Parts of the World, as Members of that *Body* to which *God* was *united* as the *Soul*, take those *Parts* for *God*. But in both cases there is a Supposition equal to justify the *Worship* if true; and if notwithstanding this Supposition, the *Heathens* were guilty of *Idolatry*; why are not you upon a far more unreasonable Supposition than that? If *Christ's Body* be present in the *Eucharist*, you say, you may worship it as there present; so say they, if *God be the Soul of the World*, we may lawfully worship the several Parts of it. But you say, *whatever is an Object of Worship, must be supposed to be; whereas you suppose the Bread not to be, but to be converted into the Body of Christ*; which alters not the Case; for the Question is not about the *bare being* or *not being* of the *thing*, but of the *being* or *not being* of a *fit Object of Worship*. I will make the Matter plain to you by this Instance: One of the most common *Idolatries* of the *Heathen* World was the *Worship* of the *Sun*; they who did worship it, did suppose it *to be a fit Object for Worship*; but they who looked on the *Sun* as a *meer Creature*, could not think so: Therefore to make any Creature a fit Object for Worship, there must go a farther Supposition, *viz.* of the *Divinity* being *in it*, or *united to it*. Now the main Point lies here; Whether on supposition, that the *substance* of the *Sun* doth *not remain*, it would *not be Idolatry*; but on supposition that *it doth remain*, it would *be Idolatry*? I pray then answer me; Would it be *Idolatry* or not to worship the *Sun*,

ſuppoſe a Man believed the very *ſubſtance* of the Sun to be *turned* into the *Divinity*?

*R. P.* No ſurely. For that is our own caſe.

*P. D.* How comes it then to be *Idolatry*, ſuppoſing the *Divinity united* to the *ſubſtance* of the *Sun*?

*R. P. In one caſe we may be ſuppoſed to worſhip a Thing which is; but in the other we cannot be ſuppoſed to worſhip that which at the ſame time we believe not to be.*

*P. D.* If it be *Idolatry* to worſhip that *as God, which is not God*, then the *Worſhip* of the *Hoſt* may be *Idolatry*, though you ſuppoſe the Bread *not to be*. For to ſuppoſe *that not to be, which really is*, doth no more alter the Caſe, than to ſuppoſe *that to be God which is not*; for that is to ſuppoſe that *not to be a Creature which is*. For the *Worſhippers* of any Parts of the World might profeſs as ſolemnly as you do about the Bread, that if they did believe *the Sun to be a meer Creature, they ſhould abhor the thoughts of worſhipping it*; but believing it either to be *God* it ſelf, or at leaſt that *the Godhead is united to it*, Why are not they as excuſable as thoſe who declare *they abhor the thoughts of worſhipping the Bread? But they believe it not to be Bread, but the Body of the Son of God.*

Catho. no Idol. p. 328.

*R. P.* But *T. G.* obſerves, *that the Formal Term of Idolatrous Worſhip is an undue Object*, viz. *a Creature inſtead of the Creator; but Catholicks, in caſe of a miſtake, would have no other Formal Object in their Minds, but the Creator himſelf.*

*P. D.* As though the *Nature* of *Idolatry* did conſiſt in the *Worſhip* of a *Creature*, knowing it to be a *meer Creature*. Might not the *Heathens* have ſaid they had no other Formal Object of Adoration in their Minds but *God*; but ſuppoſing him *united* to the *Parts* of the *World*, they might worſhip them on his account; as well as thoſe of the Church of *Rome* give *Adoration* to that which appears to be *meer Bread*? If they who worſhip the *Sun*, on the account of the *Divinity* which is in it, or united to it, be yet guilty of *Idolatry*, becauſe though on ſuppoſition the *Divinity* were ſo *united*, the Worſhip would be *lawful*, yet the *ſuppoſition* being *falſe*, they are guilty of *Idolatry*; why then ſhould not thoſe be equally guilty of it, who worſhip a *Divinity* as preſent under the *ſpecies* of *Bread*, if the *ſubſtance* of *Bread* doth ſtill remain? for then the Worſhip, however intended, falls upon a *meer Creature*, as it did in the former Caſe.

*R. P. Thoſe who worſhipped the Sun, did ſuppoſe the ſubſtance of the Sun ſtill to remain; but Catholicks do not ſuppoſe the ſubſtance of Bread to continue, but in place thereof do worſhip the only True and Eternal God.*

*P. D.* It is true, they did ſuppoſe the *ſubſtance of the Sun to remain*, but they did not intend to terminate their *Worſhip* on that *ſubſtance*, but on the *Divinity united* to it; and to ſuppoſe *that not to be Bread which is really Bread*, doth no more excuſe from *Idolatry*, than ſuppoſing that *not to be a meer Creature, which really is no more*. But to drive this Matter home to you, I will ask a farther Queſtion; Were thoſe *Idolaters* who worſhipped the *Parts* of the *World* as a part of the *ſubſtance* of *God* himſelf; ſo that he is *One and All*?

*R. P.* Suppoſe they were.

*P. D.* Did not they believe there was *no other ſubſtance but of God preſent in what they worſhipped*?

*R. P.* And what follows?

*P. D.*

*P. D.* Do you not perceive? That *to ſuppoſe that not to be which really is*, and that *to be which is not*, doth not excuſe from *Idolatry*.

*R. P.* I muſt talk a little farther with *T. G.* about this Matter. But I have another Reaſon yet to charge the *Heathens* with *Idolatry*, viz. *That they forſook the Worſhip of the Creator, and ſtaid in the Worſhip of the Creature.*

*P. D.* Do you mean that they gave him no External Worſhip, or that they gave him no Worſhip at all? Or do you think any that believed a God, gave him no inward Worſhip, *i. e.* no Reverence or Eſteem ſuitable to his Excellency?

*R. P.* Why do you ask theſe Queſtions?

*P. D.* Becauſe many of the *Heathens* thought *External Worſhip* beneath the Excellency of the Supreme God, as Dr. *St.* hath fully ſhewed from the Teſtimonies of *Porphyrius*, *Numa*, the *Platoniſts*, the *Mandarins* in *China*, and the *Inca's* of *Peru*. Is it then Idolatry to deny External Worſhip to God out of Reverence to his Majeſty, and to give it to Inferior Beings? Defence, p. 64, 65.

*R. P.* It is *Idolatry* to give all *External Worſhip to his Creatures, and to reſerve none to himſelf*; becauſe ſome External Worſhip is due to him.

*P. D.* If *External Worſhip* be due to God, it is not becauſe he needs it, but becauſe it is fit for us his Creatures, to teſtify our ſubjection to him as our Creator.

*R. P.* Be it ſo.

*P. D.* Ought not that *Worſhip* then to be ſo *peculiar* to him, as to manifeſt the different *Eſteem* we have of the *Creator* and his *Creatures*?

*R. P.* Yes.

*P. D.* Is it not then an Injury to *God's Honour* to give that *Worſhip* which ought to be *peculiar* to himſelf, to any of his *Creatures*? and that which the *Scripture* calls *Idolatry*?

*R. P.* But how will you know what *External Acts of Worſhip* thoſe are which are *peculiar* to *God*? for therein lies the great Difficulty.

*P. D.* Either we ſuppoſe *God* to have revealed his Will to Mankind, or not. If not, we have the *Light of Nature*, and the *Conſent* of *Mankind* to direct us; if he hath, we muſt conſider the *Revelation* he hath made of his *Will* in this *Matter*. For ſince *God* hath the Power to determine our Duty, and he knows beſt what makes for his Honour, it is but juſt and reaſonable that we ſhould judge of theſe things according to his *Will*. What he appoints as *due* to himſelf, becomes due by his Appointment; and to give that to another which he hath made due only to himſelf, is without queſtion the giving the Worſhip *due* to *God* to his *Creatures*; which is *Idolatry*. Our Buſineſs therefore is, to conſider whether God hath *appropriated* any *Acts* of *Worſhip* to himſelf; what thoſe *Acts* are; how far the Obligation of them doth extend to us; what we find to that purpoſe in the *Doctrine* of *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*; what the Senſe of the *Chriſtian Church* hath been concerning them in the beſt and pureſt times of it. If you can think of any better ways than theſe, I pray acquaint me with them.

*R. P.* I ſee what you are coming to, *viz. The Appropriate Acts of Divine Worſhip*; but before we debate that Buſineſs, I have ſomething more yet to ſay to you about the *Heathen Idolatry*.

*P. D.* What is that?

Dial. p. 430. *R. P. T. G.* obſerves, *that the Heathens did worſhip their Gods as ſharers with* Jupiter *in the Divine Power and Authority, and upon that account believed them to be truly and properly Gods, in whoſe Power it was to beſtow thoſe Benefits upon them, which they deſired, and they were juſtly charged* P. 425. *with Idolatry by the Fathers for ſo doing.* And he obſerves from *T. Godwin* in his Roman *Antiquities, that ſome were Gods by their own Right, others only by right of Donation: Of the former ſort were thoſe who were Partners in the Government of the World. Now*, ſaith he, *to give wor-* P. 431. *ſhip to any other beſides God, as a ſharer with him in it, though but in this or that Particular, will be Idolatry; and in this Conſideration, were there no other, they might be juſtly charged with it by the Fathers; but in our Church we own God to be the ſole Giver of every good and perfect Gift, and make our Addreſſes to Angels and Saints as his Miniſters and Servants, not to obtain of them the Benefits we deſire, but of God alone by their Interceſſion through his only Son and our only Redeemer Jeſus Chriſt, as the Council of* Trent *hath declared.*

*P. D.* Here are two Things to be cleared, (1.) How far the *Heathens* did make other *Gods ſharers with the Supreme* in the Government of the World. (2.) How far your Opinion and Practice differ from theirs.

1. How far the Heathens did make other Gods *ſharers with the Supreme* in the Government of the World. For which we are to conſider a double *Hypotheſis* which was received among the *Heathens.*

*Firſt*, Of thoſe who worſhipped the ſame God under *ſeveral Names and Titles* with reſpect to particular Powers; which Dr. *St.* proved Dr. *St.* Defence, p. 457, 458. from *Plotinus*, *Plutarch*, *Apuleius*, and your own *Simon Majolus*, who on this account commends the *Poetick Theology* beyond that of *Pythagoras* and *Socrates.* And this *Hypotheſis* S. *Auguſtin* takes particular notice Aug. de Civit. Dei, l. 4. c. 11. of, *viz. That the ſame God was* Jupiter *above*, Juno *in the Air*, Neptune *in the Sea, and in the bottom of it* Salacia, Pluto *upon Earth*, Proſerpina *under it*, Veſta *in the Hearth*, Vulcan *in the Forge*, Apollo *in Oracles*, Mercury *in Trade*, Mars *in War*, Ceres *in Corn*, Diana *in the Woods*, Minerva *among Wits; with many more which he reckons up, and then concludes, that all theſe Gods and Goddeſſes are but one* Jupiter; *or the ſeveral Parts and Powers of the ſame God; and this*, he ſaith, *was the Opinion of many learned, and great Men among them.* (Quæ ſententia velut magnorum multorumq; Doctorum eſt.) All theſe made *no ſharers in Divinity* by believing them to be *truly and properly Gods*, but only different Titles and Powers of the ſame God.

*Secondly*, There was another *Hypotheſis* more general than this, *viz.* of *one Supreme God and many inferior who were employed by him.* Of which you may remember the Words of *Tertullian, that the greateſt part aſſerted the Supreme Power to be in One, and the ſubordinate Offices to be in many.* And *Oroſius* ſaith, *that both the Philoſophers and common Heathens* Oroſ. l. 6. c. 1. *did believe One God the Author of all Things; but under this God they worſhipped many Inferior and Subſervient Gods.* In the *Council* of *Carthage*, Cypr. op. p. 448 Ed. Goulart. under *Cyprian*, *Saturninus a Tucca* (who was both a *Biſhop* and *Confeſſor*) ſaith, *that the Heathen Idolaters did acknowledge and confeſs the Supreme God, Father and Creator.* And this was ſo known a thing, that *Fauſtus* Aug. c. Fauſt. l. 20. c. 10. the *Manichee* charged the *Chriſtians with being of the ſame Faith with the Pagans, as to one Supreme God.* Although therefore the *Heathens* did own and worſhip *many Gods*, yet they looked on them as *inferior* and

*ſub-*

*ſubordinate* to the *Supreme*, and only employed by him in the Adminiſtration of things under him. And as for the *Partners* you mention, they were not ſuch *quoad plenitudinem poteſtatis*; but only made uſe of in their particular Offices; you know the Diſtinction; and it ſerves better here than in the *Court* of *Rome*. But I cannot but wonder, when *T. G.* had upbraided Dr. *St.* for two Pages together with his *Father* Livy, *Father* Varro, *Father* Cicero, *Father* Seneca, *Father* Virgil, *&c.* he ſhould at laſt ſink ſo low as to quote *Father* T. G. in his *Roman Antiquities* againſt him; ſurely any one of thoſe *Fathers* in a matter of *Roman Antiquities* would weigh down a hundred *Father* T. G.'s; and yet even this Teſtimony doth not prove that the *Gods* that were ſuppoſed to be in Heaven by their own right were *Supreme and independent Deities*, but the *Dij conſentes* were of a higher Rank than the *ſemidei* or *indigites*, the one having been always in Heaven according to the *Platoniſts* Suppoſition, the other being aſſumed from among Men; which comes at laſt to the Diſtinction of *Angels* and *Saints*. Dial. p. 316, 317.

2. How far your Opinion and Practice do differ from theirs. And here I pray remember that I go not about to compare the *Heathen Gods* with *Angels* and *Saints* as to their *Excellencies*, for the Apoſtle tells us, however the *Gentiles* intended it, they did really *ſacrifice to Devils and not to God*: But I am only to compare the Heathens *Notion* of Worſhip and yours together. And if you do allow *Gods by participation*, *viz.* Spirits aſſumed into ſuch a ſhare of Government as to have the care of ſome Things and Places committed to ſome more than to others; and if Addreſſes and Supplications are allowed to be made to them on that account, I deſire to know how the *Heathens* are juſtly charged with *Idolatry*, and you not? Was it *Idolatry* to pray to *Diana* as an inferior *Deity* which preſided over Hunting, and is it none to pray to S. *Hubert* on the like account? Was it *Idolatry* to pray to *Veſta* to preſerve from the Fire, and is it none to pray to S. *Agatha*? If two Perſons in the ſame Storm prayed as to their *Tutelar Deities*, the one to *Neptune*, the other to S. *Paul*; is the one guilty of *Idolatry*, and the other not? If two Women in Travail prayed for help, the one to *Lucina*, the other to the *B. Virgin*, is the firſt only guilty of *Idolatry*? They might be accuſed of *Ignorance* and *Folly* in making a bad choice, but I do not ſee how the *Heathens* could be charged with *Idolatry*, and not the other. When *Saints* are *Canonized* to be *Particular Patrons* of *Places*, as S. *Roſa* lately for *Peru*; why may not the Inhabitants make particular Addreſſes to her as their *Patroneſs*, and *Tutelar Deity*, as *Lipſius* did to the *B. Virgin*? Is not this to make ſuch a *Saint* a *ſharer in the Government* of the World, as much as the *Heathens* did their *Tutelar Gods* under *one Supreme*? And therefore upon *T. G.*'s own ground, you are as juſtly charged with *Idolatry* as the *Heathens* were. For the *Heathens* did not look on their *Tutelar Gods* as the *Original Givers*, but as the *ſubordinate Miniſters*.

*R. P.* But as *T. G.* ſaith, *we do not pray to them to obtain the things we deſire, but that they would be our Interceſſors with God for us.*

*P. D.* I wonder *T. G.* would ſay this again without anſwering what Dr. *St.* had ſaid in his late *Defence* to ſhew (1.) That the very words of the *Council* of *Trent* do allow more than *bare interceſſion*. (2.) That *formal Prayers* to them to beſtow Bleſſings, are allowed and practiſed among them; of which he produces ſeveral *Inſtances* of preſent uſe in the approved *Books* of *Devotion*. (3.) That ſuch Prayers do not contradict any received *Doctrine* of the *Roman Church*: and he challenges *T. G.* Def. p. 293, &c. P. 295, &c. P. 300.

to

to shew, what *Article* of your *Creed*, what *Decree* of your *Church*, what *Doctrine* of your *Divines* it doth contradict, for any Man to pray directly to the *Virgin* Mary *for the Destruction of Heresies*, *Support under Troubles*, *Grace to withstand Temptations*, and *Reception to Glory*? And what can we beg for more from God himself? But I do not yet understand how you can charge those *Heathens* with *Idolatry*, who owned a *Supreme God* and worshipped *inferior Deities* as *subordinate* to them, and their *Images*; but the Charge will return upon your selves.

Dial. p. 437. *R. P.* Will you never be satisfied? Did not *T. G.* say, *They were justly charged with it on Two Accounts.* (1.) *Because those Images were instituted by Publick Authority, for the Worship of false Gods; and they concurred with the Vulgar in all the External Practices of their Idolatry.* (2.) *Because, though in their Schools they denied them to be Gods, yet they gave Divine Honour to them as the People did.*

*P. D.* You must excuse me, Sir; I have such an Imperfection in my Understanding, that it will not be satisfy'd, without the Appearance at least of Reason; which, I confess, I cannot yet see in this Answer. For, I pray, how comes it to be *Idolatry* in them, who give only an *Inferior* and *Relative Worship*, if that Worship be not *Idolatry*?

Dial. p. 438. *R. P. T. G.* saith, *They were not guilty of Internal Idolatry, but of External; complying with the Vulgar, who did worship them as truly and properly Gods; and that in such a manner that they were judged to do the same thing: And therefore, it was at least an Exterior Profession of Idolatry in them.*

*P. D.* But you have not yet proved, That the *Gentiles* did worship many *Independent Gods*: And I have very lately shewed the contrary, from the express Testimonies of the Fathers; and therefore this Answer doth not reach to the Case. Yet suppose, that against the general Sense of understanding Men, the Common People should take the *Inferior Gods* for *Independent and Absolute* Deities; Is not this the Case of your own Church? As Dr. *St.* observed, the Common People take their *Images* for *Gods*, or take the *B. Virgin* for the *Queen of Heaven*, and pray to them accordingly; which is both *Internal* and *External Idolatry* in them; however *T. G.* and their Learned Men, comply with them in all their *External Acts* of *Worship*: Are they guilty of the *Exterior Profession of Idolatry*, or not?

Dial. p. 441. *R. P.* I thought where you would be: *But it is the same Case of some few Men complying with a Common and Publick Custom of Idolatrous Worship; and of those who follow the Publick Profession, and do the same Acts with some Private Men, who turn them to Idolatrous Worship?*

*P. D.* But if the *Publick Profession* of the *Gentiles* was to *worship* One *Supreme God*, as I have already proved, then the Case is the very same, as to the *Profession* and *Practice of Idolatry*; which is the main thing insisted on. And the shewing of many other Circumstantial Differences will not vary the Case, and destroy the Parallel. If this be all you have to add about the *Heathen Idolatry*, I pray let us come to the *Appropriate Acts* of *Divine Worship*. For, since God may appropriate Acts of Worship to himself; since upon that they become due only to him; since *Idolatry* is Giving to the Creature *the Worship due to God*; Dr. *St.* from hence proves, That they who do those *Acts*, by way of Worship, to any Creature, must be guilty of *Idolatry*.

Dial. p. 444.

*R. P. As to this mighty Argument*, T. G. saith, *the only thing to be wondred at in it, are the many Equivocations, False Suppositions, and Self-contradictions contained in it.* Dial. p. 447.

*P. D.* Fair and soft, Good Sir; let us not have so many Charges at one time: Take which of them you please, provided you hold to it, and not ramble from one to another.

*R. P. What is it you understand by Appropriate Acts of Divine Worship? For more or less may be required, and so the Term be equivocal.*

*P. D.* I mean such, which by his Appointment and Command become due to him: And by his Prohibition to give them to any other, they become due only to him.

*R. P. There is something still wanting to make the Argument conclusive against us; which is, That God hath so tied these Acts to his own Worship, that in all Cases, and upon all Occasions imaginable, they become incommunicable to any other, and this so fastned to them, that it cannot be separated from them. For if the Appropriation may be separated upon any Accounts, we may and will pretend it is.* Dial. p. 448.

*P. D.* How doth it appear necessary, that such an *Appropriation* must be in all *Circumstances*? Is it not sufficient that it be in all Acts of Religious Worship? For instance, *Adoration* is an *appropiate Act of Divine Worship*, but he doth not hereby exclude mens bowing to each other on account of civil Respect; but where the Circumstances of Time, Place, *&c.* do shew it is for *Religious Worship*, there Dr. *St.* saith it ought to be given to none else but God.

*R. P. But if those Acts be communicable to any other besides God, as limited with such and such Circumstances, they are not absolutely appropriated to God in all cases and upon all accounts imaginable; and so the Argument doth not conclude.* Dial. p. 449.

*P. D.* I wonder to hear you talk at this rate. For the Force of your Argument lies in this, If it be lawful to bow to one another on a civil Account, then *Religious Worship* is not appropriated to God; what a strange Consequence is this? Dr. *St.* doth say, that the Circumstances of Time and Place, *&c.* do put a sufficient Discrimination between *Acts* of *Civil* and *Religious Worship*; as between eating and drinking upon a natural account at a common Table, and eating and drinking at the Eucharist. What a senseless way of reasoning were this, for a Man to say, that eating and drinking could not be appropriated to that Act of *Divine Worship* in Celebration of the Lord's Supper, because Men eat and drink upon other Occasions? It is true, they do so and must do so if they would live; but what then? May not Christ therefore institute a Supper of his own, with such Rites and Solemnities belonging to it, as may sufficiently discriminate it from a common eating and drinking? And were it not a horrible Prophanation to appoint such a Supper as that of our *Lord*'s is, in commemoration of S. *Francis*, or *Ignatius Loyola*? I see, I must put some Questions to you to make you apprehend this a little better, than I fear you do. Is not the Celebration of the *Eucharist an appropriate Act of Divine Worship* now under *the Gospel*?

*R. P.* I do not well know what you mean.

*P. D.* So I thought by your way of talking. Is it lawful to meet together at *Mass*, to set apart Bread and Wine, and afterwards to partake of them with a design to commemorate S. *Francis* and St. *Rosa*, by such a Solemnity?

*R. P.* I

*R. P.* I think not; becauſe that would be a prophane Imitation of our *Lord's Supper*, which was inſtituted by *Chriſt* himſelf for the Commemoration of his own Sufferings.

*P. D.* But is it not lawful to eat Bread and to drink Wine together?

*R. P.* Who doubts of that?

*P. D.* But eating Bread and drinking Wine are the ſame *Acts in Subſtance* which are uſed at the *Lord's Supper.*

*R. P.* And what then?

*P. D.* Then the *Subſtance* of the *Acts* being the ſame when done upon a *civil* and a *religious Account* doth not take off from the *Appropriation* of them to *God* when the Circumſtances declare it to be an *Act* of *Religious Worſhip.* Therefore when a Diſpute ariſes concerning the *Nature* of an *Act*, whether it be for *Civil* or *Religious Worſhip*, common Prudence is to judge of that from the *Circumſtances* of it; if once it be found to be for *Religious Worſhip*, then comes in the Conſideration of the *Law* of *God*, and the *Appropriation* of all *Acts* of *Religious Worſhip* to *God* alone. And by this time I hope you underſtand how impertinent it is to ſay, that if there be *appropriate Acts* of *Divine Worſhip*, they muſt be ſo in all Caſes and upon all Accounts imaginable. Which is as much as to ſay, that eating Bread and drinking Wine in a ſolemn manner, in a place appointed for Divine Worſhip, cannot be appropriated to the *Lord's Supper*, unleſs we never eat Bread, or drink Wine, but upon that Occaſion.

Dial. p. 450. *R. P. But what are theſe appropriate Acts of Divine Worſhip? For it may be ſome further light may be gathered from the Acts themſelves.*

*P. D.* Dr. *St.* hath named ſix; *Sacrifice*, *Religious Adoration*, *Solemn Invocation*, *Erecting Temples and Altars*, *Burning of Incenſe*, *Making of Vows.*

*R. P. Hath God tyed us by his command to offer Sacrifice, or burn Incenſe, or make Vows to him? How then can he argue the Romaniſts guilty of Idolatry upon the account of giving Acts appropriated to God to others beſide him, when himſelf if put to it, will deny that God hath commanded them to be done at all to him?*

*P. D.* To clear this matter a little more to you, you may conſider two things concerning *appropriate Acts of Divine Worſhip.* 1. The *general Prohibition* of giving *Religious Worſhip* to any thing beſides *God.* Mat. 4. 10. Which our Saviour hath delivered in thoſe words, *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve.* Which the *Primitive Church* took for their fundamental *Rule* of *Worſhip*; and underſtood it in this ſenſe, That all *Acts* of *Religious Worſhip* were to be performed to *God* alone. And therefore of what kind ſoever the *Acts* were, whether we were tied to perform them to *God* or not, if they were looked on as *Acts* of *Religious Worſhip* given to any *Creature*, they utterly and peremptorily refuſed to do them, and rather choſe to ſuffer Martyrdom; as was plain in the caſe of burning *Incenſe* to the *Emperors Image.* No *Chriſtians* did then think that we were tied to offer Incenſe to God, and yet they eſteemed it *Idolatry* to offer Incenſe to any *Creature*; therefore it is not neceſſary to the Nature of *Idolatry*, that the *Act* of *Worſhip* be ſuch *as we are tied to give unto God*; it being ſufficient that it is an Act of *Religious Worſhip*; and the giving of any ſuch to a Creature is *Idolatry*; and without this, it is impoſſible to defend the *Martyrs* of the *Primitive Church*; which all *Chriſtians* are bound to do.

2. As

2 As to *particular Acts* of *Divine Worſhip*, though they are always unlawful to be given to any thing beſides *God*, yet we are not tied after the *ſame manner* to perform them to him. For (1.) Some *Acts* of *Worſhip* are natural and always equally agreeing to the *Majeſty* of *God*; ſuch as *Prayer* and *Invocation*; *Dependance* on his *Goodneſs* and *Providence*; *Thankſgiving* for *Mercies* received, and all internal *Acts* of *Worſhip*, which reſult from the Relation we ſtand in to *God*, and the Apprehenſions we ought to have of his *Perfections*; as *Fear* from his *Power*, *Submiſſion* from his *Providence*, *Faith* and *Truſt* in him from his *Truth* and *Wiſdom*, *Love* from his *Goodneſs*, &c. All theſe are *neceſſary Acts* of *Worſhip*, and *proper* to *God*. (2.) Some *Acts* of *Worſhip* are *appropriated* to him *when they are due*, but they are *not always due*; ſuch as *making Vows*, and *ſwearing by his Name*. Although we are not tied to perform theſe at any certain times, yet whenever they are done, they muſt be done to *God* alone. (3.) Some *Acts* are not *neceſſary* to be done to God at all; and yet it is *unlawful* to do them to any other. And of this kind are the *offering Sacrifices and burning Incenſe*; which were ſtrictly required under the *Law*; but that Diſpenſation expiring after the coming of *Chriſt*, the Obligation to thoſe *Acts* was wholly taken away; and yet it was *Idolatry* to uſe them to any thing *beſides God*, becauſe they were *Acts* of *Religious Worſhip*; and therefore if to be performed at all, they were ſo due to him that they could not without *Idolatry* be applied to any beſides him. And thus, I hope, I have a little helped your Underſtanding about theſe *appropriate Acts of Divine Worſhip*.

*R. P. But the force of the ceremonial Law being taken away; whatever is not obliging by the Law of Nature, or ſome expreſs Declaration of the Will of Chriſt, is left at liberty for the Church to uſe conformably to the light of Nature and the deſign of Chriſt's Doctrine.* Dial. p. 452.

*P. D.* All this I yield. But that which I inſiſt upon, is that *fundamental Precept of Worſhip* as declared by Chriſt, *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God and him only ſhalt thou ſerve.*

*R. P. But do you think that Chriſt hath made a re-eſtabliſhment of thoſe Acts in the new Law which were before peculiar to God, as Sacrifice, Incenſe,* &c. *for then Chriſtians will be as much bound by this Precept to give them to God, as not to give them to any other. But if they are not re-eſtabliſhed, how doth it follow, that becauſe they were appropriated to God by the Law, therefore now that Law is taken away, they are forbidden to any other beſides God?* Dial. p. 454.

*P. D.* I do not ſay that Chriſt did intend a re-eſtabliſhment of thoſe *Acts* of *Worſhip* which were peculiar to the *Law* of *Moſes*; but I do ſay, that *Chriſt* by this Precept as explained by himſelf, doth make it utterly unlawful to perform any Act of *Religious Worſhip to any but God alone*. And if this be all you have to prove the *Maſs* of *Equivocations*, *Falſe Suppoſitions*, and *Self-contradictions* in Dr. *St.'s* Diſcourſe of *appropriate Acts of Divine Worſhip*, it had been more for *T. G.'s* Honour to have paſſed over this with as much Silence as he did many other places which he found too hard for him.

*R. P. Suppoſe this Argument were good, it proves nothing againſt us, who neither give any Act abſolutely appropriated to God to any elſe beſides him; nor any other in the manner it is appropriated to him.* Dial. p. 455.

*P. D.* If you perform any Act of *Religious Worſhip* either to *Saints* or *Images*, this Diſcourſe muſt concern you; becauſe the Law againſt the Worſhip of Images is ſtill in force among Chriſtians; and our Savi-

our's general Rule doth forbid all External *Acts* of *Religious Worſhip* being applied to any beſides *God.*

Dial. p. 456. *R. P. Nay, ſuppoſing thoſe External Acts of Worſhip to be now due to God by his Law, the giving them to any beſides himſelf will not be to give to the Creature the Worſhip due to God, unleſs it be done with intention to give them to a Creature as eſteemed worthy of Divine Honour. For that is the Definition of real Idolatry.*

*P. D.* Then the *Mandarins* in *China*, who performed all External Acts of Adoration in the *Temple* of the *Tutelar Spirits*, ſecretly directing their Intention to a *Crucifix*, were not guilty of *Idolatry*; notwithſtanding the *Decree* of the *Congregation* at *Rome.* For they did not perform thoſe *Acts*, with an intention to give the Worſhip to the *Tutelar Spirits as eſteemed worthy of Divine Honour.* Then the *Thurificati* of the *Primitive Church*, who through Fear offered *Incenſe*, could not be charged with *Idolatry*; nor *Marcellinus*, though he ſacrificed in the *Temple* of *Veſta*, when he only complied with *Diocleſian.* But did not *T. G.* blame the *Philoſophers for an exterior Profeſſion of Idolatry*? What is that I beſeech you? Is it *Idolatry* or not? Doth not *T. G.* grant, *that there ought in Reaſon to be ſome peculiar external Acts appropriated to the Worſhip of God as moſt agreeable to his incommunicable Excellency?* Why ſo, I pray; is it not, becauſe *God's incommunicable Excellency* requires an *External Worſhip* peculiar to it ſelf? And if ſo, is it not to give the Worſhip due to *God* to ſomething elſe, to apply thoſe Acts which are peculiar to himſelf, to any thing beſides him? This Debate in truth comes to this Point at laſt, whether there ought to be any ſuch thing as a peculiar *external Worſhip* of *God* or not? For, if external Worſhip be due to him, and ſuch Worſhip be due to him alone for his incommunicable Excellency, then the giving external Worſhip to a Creature, muſt be giving to it what is due only to God. And to reſolve the Nature of *Idolatry* into the *inward Intention*, is all one as if one ſhould ſay, that Adultery were to lie with another Man's Wife with an Intention to Cuckold her Husband; but if a Man did it out of Love to her Perſon, it were no Adultery. Why is there not an external Act of *Idolatry*, as well as of Perjury, Theft, Murder and the like? Where doth the Scripture give the leaſt Intimation that the Nature of *Idolatry* is to be taken from the *inward Intention*, when the *Law* is expreſs againſt the outward Action? And all Men are charged with *Idolatry* who are guilty of the external Acts, without running into the Thoughts and Deſigns of their Hearts? Nay, your own Authors cannot deny that there is an *external Idolatry* as well as *internal*; and where the outward Acts are Idolatrous we ought to preſume there was an implicit and indirect Intention; and no more is neceſſary to make an Act Idolatrous than a voluntary Inclination to do it. This is therefore a meer ſubterfuge, and can never ſatisfy a Man's Conſcience, nor excuſe the *Roman* Church from Idolatry.

Dial. p. 467.

Dial. p. 457. *R. P.* But *T. G.* grants, that *ſuppoſing ſuch an Appropriation of external Acts to remain in force; to apply ſuch Acts to a Creature may and ought in Reaſon to be interpreted to be real Idolatrous Worſhip; becauſe Idolatry is a ſin directly oppoſite to Religion, as a falſe Worſhip to a true one.*

*P. D.* What is it then but to cavil about Words, to deny that to be *real Idolatry* which at the ſame time he confeſſes ought to be interpreted to be ſo? For ſince we cannot judge of Men's *Intentions* but by their *Actions*, when we diſpute about the *Idolatry* practiſed in any *Church*, we

can

can be understood only of that which lies open to our Judgment, and that can be only the *external Act.* And since *T. G.* grants, *that the thing which the Dr. means is confessed by your selves to be inconsistent with Salvation*, there is nothing further necessary to be done, but to debate whether you are guilty of that Sin or not, in applying appropriate Acts of *Divine Worship* to a Creature. Dial. p. 461.

*R. P. But doth not Dr.* St. *himself shew from Card.* Tolet, *that Idolatry doth suppose an Error in the Mind, in judging that to deserve divine Honour which doth not?* Dial. p. 458.

*P. D.* I grant it, but that only shews what *practical Judgment* doth precede a voluntary Act of Idolatry: As it is distinguished from an involuntarily compliance. In this later Case, Persons are really Guilty as to the external Act; as a Man that takes away his Neighbours Goods out of Fear of his own Life is really Guilty of Theft, although the Fear he was in may lessen the wilfulness of it: So Idolatry when committed through the Power of a sudden Passion, is a Sin of the same kind with other Idolatry, but not so wilful and deliberate a Sin. But in case of *wilful Idolatry*, there must be a practical Judgment determining the Will to the Act of Idolatry. If you ask me what that Judgment is, whether true, or erroneous; I say it is an erroneous Judgment, for it determines the giving Divine Worship to that which doth not deserve it. Not as though Idolatry implied *the believing that to be truly and properly God which is not*; (which *T. G.* would infer from thence) but it implies only the practical Judgment determining the Will to give Divine Worship to that which really deserves it not. As for instance; suppose an Image of our Lady to stand before two Persons; the one declares against the *Worship* of it, though he may be forced to do it, he is guilty of real but involuntary Idolatry (taking involuntary as to the free Inclination of the Will); the other readily and spontaneously falls down upon his Knees before it, and says his Prayers to the *Image* as gravely and devoutly as if the *B. Virgin* were present; both these do concur in the same external Act of Worship, but from a very different Judgment; the one judges it fit to comply for his own safety; the other judges the thing fit to be done: But it is not necessary that he judges the Image to be the *B. Virgin* her self, but that he ought to give such *Worship* to her Image; so that judging Divine Worship to belong to that which doth not really deserve it, is all the erroneous Judgment necessary to a wilful Act of *Idolatry*; and if this be any kindness to *T. G.* much good may it do him. Dial. p. 459.

*R. P.* But *T. G.* saith, *that from hence it follows, that it is not real Idolatry to worship an Image with Divine Worship unless it be done out of an erroneous Judgment, as to a thing that deserves Divine Honour.* Dial. p. 459.

*P. D.* No such matter; for from hence it only follows, that in a wilful *Act* of *Idolatry* there must be a practical Judgment determining the Act of Divine Worship to an Image, though it deserves it not. So that this doth not refer to the manner of applying the external Act to the Object *as deserving Divine Honour*, but only the antecedent Judgment that the Act of Divine Worship be given to such an Object.

*R. P.* Again *T. G.* saith, *that from hence it follows, that the case of the Heathens and ours is different, because their Idolatry proceeded upon an erroneous Belief of a Creatures deserving Divine Honour when it doth not; but we do no such thing.*

*P. D.* Cannot *T. G.* understand the Difference between an *erroneous Belief* and an *erroneous practical Judgment?* I do not deny that the *Hea-*

*thens* had a very erroneous Belief in many Particulars; and so have other *Idolaters* too. But the Question now is, what *Error of Judgment* that is, which the *wilful Act* of *Idolatry* doth suppose; and I say, it requires no more than an Error in the practical Judgment, determining the Will to give Divine Worship to that which doth not deserve it. And herein I see no difference between the Heathens Idolatry and yours.

Dial. p. 465. *R. P. But let us now set aside the strict Notion of Idolatry, and consider, whether the Church of* Rome *be guilty of damnable Sin in the manner of their Worship, which must either be in not giving to God the Worship due to him, or by giving the Worship due only to him to his Creatures.*

*P. D.* The latter is that which Dr. *St.* chiefly insists upon, although, he saith, your Divines are to blame in the first Particular, because they Defence, p. 204, &c. reserve *no one Act of external Adoration as proper to God, and to be performed by all Christians*; and for this he quotes the Resolution of *Cardinal Lugo.*

*R. P.* I wonder you would mention that Citation of *Lugo*, since *T. G.* saith, the Dr. is so unhappy in his Citations: And *the Jesuits will say,* Dial. p. 469. *that he evidently abuses both his Authority and his Eminency.*

*P. D.* I have had so much Experience of *T. G.*'s intolerable disingenuity in this matter, that I durst venture an even Wager (which is the way *T. G.* proposes often in his *Dialogues* for ending such Disputes) that Dr. *St.* hath not miscited *Cardinal Lugo.*

*R. P. T. G.* saith, *that Cardinal* Lugo *doth not deny Sacrifice to be an external Act of Worship proper to God; for his words are,* qui non potest offerri nisi soli Deo, *as may not be offered but to God alone; but, he saith, that Sacrifice is not properly an Act of Adoration in the strict Sense, but of another kind distinct from it.*

*P. D.* Those are not *Lugo*'s Words, but *licet non possit offerri nisi soli Deo*; yet I shall not insist upon that. For that which sufficiently clears Dr. *St.* is, the Consideration of his Design in bringing those words of *Lugo*, which was to prove that there is no one *external Act of Adoration* which is proper to *Latria*, or the *Worship* peculiar to God. And are not *Lugo*'s Words plain and full to this purpose?

*R. P.* That cannot be denied; but he takes *Adoration in the stricter Sense.*

*P. D.* Let him take it in what Sense he will; doth he not speak of the *Adoration* proper to *Latria*, or the Worship peculiar to God? And doth not *Latria* take in any *peculiar Act of Divine Worship*? And if there be *no external Act of Adoration* peculiar to *God*, doth it not follow, that there is no peculiar Act whereby you express your inward Submission to God in all things? for that, *Lugo* saith, is the *strict Sense of Adoration* he there means. And doth not this fully prove what Dr. *St.* brought this Testimony for?

*R. P. But the Church of* Rome *doth hold Sacrifice to be peculiar to God.*

Dial. p. 217. *P. D.* And doth not Dr. *St.* say as much? For his words are, that you confess, that Sacrifice is so peculiar to God that it ought not to be offered to any else; but not as an *Act* of *Latria*, saith *Cardinal Lugo*, for there is *no Act of Adoration that is so*; but upon another Account, as it signifies *God's absolute Dominion over us as to Life and Death, and that we ought to lay down our own Lives when he calls for them.* Which is to make *Sacrifice* a *significant Ceremony peculiar to God*, expressing his *Sovereignty*, but not an *immediate Act of Worship* peculiar to him: *for of*

*that*

*that kind*, he ſaith, *there is none.* And therefore according to him, your Church hath *no one External Act of Divine Worſhip ſo proper to God, that it may not be offered but to him alone.*

And from hence it appears that *Lugo* did not take *Adoration* merely for *that Act of Religious Worſhip which is performed by the Motion of the Body*, as *T. G.* ſuggeſts; but for whatſoever *Act* that may tend to expreſs *the ſubmiſſion of our Souls to God*; of which ſort he denies any to be *peculiar* to *God's Worſhip.* And what can be more contrary to that which *T. G* admits for a *Law* of *Nature*, viz. *That Man ought to uſe ſome External Acts to teſtifie his ſubmiſſion to God, and therefore there ought to be ſome peculiar External Acts appropriated to the Worſhip of God, as moſt agreeable to his Incommunicable Excellency?* I could not but rejoice to ſee *T. G.* own ſo reaſonable a Principle, and I deſire no other, as to the mere Light of Nature to prove your Idolatry. For, if this be a Principle of *Natural Religion*, then Idolatry even by the Light of Nature, lies in applying appropriate Acts of Divine Worſhip to any but to God himſelf; for ſince his Excellency is Incommunicable, and the Submiſſion we owe to God peculiar to him, and that Submiſſion ought to be expreſſed by External Acts, all which *T. G.* grants; then all thoſe who do uſe ſuch Acts to any beſides God, are guilty of giving the Worſhip due to God unto a Creature. For God hath not only a right to our *inward Submiſſion*, but to the *Acknowledgment* of it, which cannot be done but by *External Acts:* And which is obſervable as to this Matter, the Honour of God, as to his Incommunicable Excellencies, with reſpect to Mankind as a Body, doth not lie in the bare Acts of the *Mind*, but in the External Performance of *Religious Worſhip* to him. For, if it be neceſſary that *God's Authority* be owned in the World, it is neceſſary it be done by *viſible Acts of Worſhip*; which ought to be ſo appropriated to him, that any one who diſcerns them may ſee the difference put between God and all his Creatures. For herein lies the Manifeſtation of that inward ſenſe we have of *God's Incommunicable Excellencies*, when we ſet apart Times, and Places, and Offices of *Religious Worſhip*, by which we declare our Submiſſion to God, as our Creator and Governor of the World. And the confounding this diſtance between *God* and his *Creatures* is the great Sin of Idolatry: From whence *Aquinas* and others conclude it to be a *Sin of the higheſt Nature, and including Blaſphemy in it, becauſe it robs God of the Honour due to him for his Incommunicable Excellencies.*

Dial. p. 468.

Dial. p. 467.

Defence, p. 194, to 199.

*R. P. What do you mean by this appropriating Acts of Worſhip to God? Do you mean all of them ſo abſolutely appropriated to God, that it is not lawful upon any account to give them to any other? And then the Quakers will be the only good Chriſtians in the World; or only ſome of them, and not others, as kneeling and proſtrating, but not bowing; and then you muſt tell us what makes the Diſcrimination.*

Dial. p. 470.

*P. D.* I mean that which all Mankind meant, when they ſet apart Times, and Places, and Offices for *Divine Worſhip*; and every Man by the help of his Mother-Wit, knew the difference between going to *ſerve God*, and going to *Market.* I ſay then, as Dr. *St.* did, that the Circumſtances do ſufficiently diſcriminate Acts of a *Religious*, and of a *Civil Nature.*

Defence, p. 192.

*R. P. May not the Churches Declaration, that ſuch Acts are intended only for Inferior Worſhip towards Images or Saints, make a ſufficient Diſcrimination between ſuch Acts, and thoſe which are appropriated to God?*

Dial. p. 471.

*P. D.* If

*P. D.* If you ſuppoſe the whole Power of determining Acts of *Divine Worſhip* to lie in your Churches Breaſt, you had asked a very material Queſtion: But in this Caſe, there is a Law of God antecedently prohibiting ſuch Acts being given to any beſides God himſelf; and this Law was ſo underſtood by the *Chriſtian Church*, when the Chriſtian Religion put Men upon ſuffering *Martyrdom* on that Principle, that all Religious Worſhip was appropriated to God: Becauſe Chriſt had ſaid, *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve.*

Dial. p. 472. *R. P. Who is ſo blind as not to ſee, that this Prohibition fell upon the External Act, as determined to be a Sign of Religious Worſhip, by the Circumſtances in which it was required?*

*P. D.* And what then, I pray? For doth it not equally fall upon all External Acts, where the Circumſtances do determine them to be Signs of *Religious Worſhip?* Which is all I deſire.

Dial. p. 473. *R. P. Doth not this juſtifie the Quakers in denying to give any External Honour to a Creature?*

*P. D.* So far from it, that it ſhews the Folly of their Doctrine, which aroſe from not being able to diſtinguiſh Acts of *Religious* and *Civil Worſhip.*

*R. P. But* Dr. St. *allows ſome kind of Religious Worſhip to be given to a Creature.*

*P. D.* Not any which is *Religious* in its *Nature*, or by *Circumſtances*; but that which might be ſo called, being required by the Rule of Religion, as *Civil Worſhip* is.

Dial. p. 474. *R. P. But he allows Religious Reſpect to Places, and Religious Honour to Saints; and then why not thoſe Acts we give to Images and Saints on the ſame Accounts?*

*P. D.* Becauſe the Circumſtances do declare thoſe are not Acts of Religious Worſhip; but thoſe you give to *Images* and *Saints* are.

Dial. p. 479. *R. P. I ſee the weight of this whole Debate lies at laſt upon this Determination of Circumſtances; but how comes the Dr. after all the great buſtle he makes about God's appropriating External Acts of Worſhip to himſelf, to put the Trial of his Cauſe at laſt upon the Determination of Circumſtances?*

*P. D.* What other way ſhould the difference of Moral Actions be tried? What Incongruity is there between *God's appropriating Acts of Religious Worſhip to himſelf*, and the finding out what *thoſe Acts* are by the *Circumſtances*? Is it not thus in the other *Commandments*? *God* in general forbids *Murder*, *Theft*, and *Adultery*; but are not thoſe prohibited *Acts* to be judged by the *Circumſtances*? For, there is the ſame ſubſtance of the *Act* in lawful and unlawful Actions. If a Man kills another by chance, or out of Malice; if a Man takes away another Man's Goods with his conſent, or without, it is the ſame Act as to its Subſtance; and what Diſcrimination can be made but by the Circumſtances? And therefore I cannot but wonder to hear you object againſt this, or think it any Repugnancy to *God's appropriated Acts of Divine Worſhip to himſelf.*

Dial. p. 479. *R. P. How can the Nature of ſuch Acts be determined wholly by Circumſtances, unleſs the Appropriation of them be taken away? For if that continues, the Law determines the Nature of the Acts.*

*P. D.* Do you not apprehend the difference between the *Diſcrimination* of *Acts* of *Civil* and *Religious Worſhip*, and the *Appropriation* of the latter to *God* by his *Law*? I ſay the Law makes them *peculiar to God*, when they are found to be *Acts* of *Religious Worſhip*, but the Circum-

*Circumſtances* are to determine whether they are *Civil* or *Religious Acts.* As all Acts of Murder are forbidden by God's Law, but whether ſuch an Act be Murder or no, is to be judged by Circumſtances.

*R. P. But then if the External Acts of Worſhip given to Creatures in the Church of* Rome *chance to prove accompanied with ſuch Circumſtances, by which they may, and generally are underſtood not to be Acts of Divine Worſhip, but of Inferior Veneration, then they are acquitted from the guilt of Idolatry, according to the Dr.'s own Principles.*

*P. D.* No ſuch Matter; unleſs we ſuppoſe thoſe Acts to be wholly indifferent, and left free by any Divine Law; and that it is in the *Churches Power* to declare what is to paſs for *Divine Worſhip*, and what for *Inferior Worſhip.* But no particular *Circumſtances* can make an Act *lawful*, which the Law of God hath made unlawful. As ſuppoſe the *Spartan* Commonwealth allow Pilfering, or taking away Goods from each other without conſent of the Owners, here is one *Circumſtance* which goes a great way towards the altering the Nature of ſuch *Actions*; but if there be an antecedent *Law of God* which makes ſuch Acts *unlawful*, they remain ſo ſtill, notwithſtanding the Declaration of the *Spartan* State. Juſt thus it is in the preſent Caſe; your Church declares ſuch *Acts* of *Worſhip* may be lawfully applied to *Images* and *Saints*: But what then? Hath your *Church* the *Power* to repeal the *Law* of *God?* If not, the Acts remain as *unlawful* as ever, notwithſtanding the *Circumſtance* of ſuch a *Declaration.*

*R. P.* But *T. G.* ſaith, *All Dr.* St.*'s Diſcourſe about Diſcrimination of Acts of Civil and Religious Worſhip by Circumſtances, is only a popular Diſcourſe, and upon enquiry will be found as incoherent and weak as an Adverſary could wiſh.* Dial. p. 481.

*P. D.* I ſhall not take *T. G.*'s Judgment in this Matter; for I have not found him ſo Impartial and Juſt, that I ſhould ſubmit to his Arbitration. If you have any thing to object againſt that Diſcourſe, I do not queſtion we ſhall hear of it.

*R. P. Firſt, Acts take their Nature from the formal Reaſon or Account upon which they tend to their Objects, and from thence they become either Civil or Religious, though they may receive another Denomination from the Circumſtances which do accompany them.* P. 482.

*P. D.* I pray conſider, the thing we enquire after, is the difference between *Acts* of *Civil* and *Religious Worſhip*; which Dr. *St.* ſaith is to be taken from the *Circumſtances.* *No*, ſay you, *it muſt be taken from the formal Reaſon, or account on which they tend to their Objects*: But the *formal Reaſon* of *Acts* being ſecret and inviſible, the queſtion is, whether that be ſufficient to put a *Diſcrimination* between *Acts* of an external and viſible nature, as thoſe of *Civil* and *Religious Worſhip* are. I will make this plain to you by a noted Inſtance: While the *Chriſtian Emperoos* required no more than mere *Civil Worſhip*, the *Chriſtians* made no ſcruple of giving it to them in the ſame Poſtures which were uſed in *Divine Worſhip*. But when they ſuſpected that *Divine Worſhip* was required, they utterly refuſed it. Here we have the *ſame Acts* as to the *Subſtance* of them in both Caſes; and yet the *Chriſtians* could eaſily diſcern which did belong to *Civil*, and which to *Religious Worſhip*: Was it from ſuch a *Reaſon* and *Intention* of the *Perſons* which none could know but the Doers? Or elſe from the *Circumſtances*, which did make it appear that more than *Civil Worſhip* was required? And yet this *Worſhip* which the *Heathens* gave to their *Emperors*, was only an *inferior*

*ſort*

*ſort of Divine Worſhip*, and ſo underſtood by the general Conſent of the *Heathens* themſelves From whence we gather, (1.) That the *Diſcrimination* of Acts of *Civil* and *Divine Worſhip*, do not depend upon the *Intention* of the *Doer*, but the *outward Circumſtances* of them. For if it had depended on the inward Intention of the Perſon, the *Chriſtians* might have ſaved their Lives and Honours, by doing the *External Acts* with a *different Intention*; and that which was *Divine Worſhip* in him that deſigned it for ſuch, were but *Civil Worſhip* in him that intended no more. (2.) That the Declaration of an *inferior ſort of Divine Worſhip* doth not make it *lawful*. For it could be no otherwiſe underſtood by the *Chriſtians*, and yet they refuſed it as *Idolatrous Worſhip*.

*R. P.* (2.) *If the Circumſtances of Time, and Place, and ſuch like, do ſo reſtrain and limit the ſignification of External Acts, that it is eaſy to diſcern one Worſhip from another, how can you make it out that the People did not give Religious Worſhip to* David, *when in a moſt ſolemn Act of Devotion it is ſaid, that the People worſhipped the Lord and the King? Where we ſee the ſame Act at the ſame Time, a Time of Solemn Devotion, given to God and the King, and the People never charged for giving Religious Worſhip to the King.*

*P. D. T. G.* need not have gone ſo far back for ſuch an Argument. For the *King's Chaplains* in a Sacred Place, and at a Solemn Time of *Devotion*, do bow Three Times to the King, when they enter into the Pulpit; and yet who is there imagines they give him *Divine Worſhip*? It is not therefore the *Circumſtance of Time and Place alone*, which Dr. *St.* makes to diſcriminate *Civil* and *Religious Worſhip*; but the *Concurrence* of all Circumſtances together. If I bowed to a Friend at *Church*, is any Man ſo ſenſeleſs to take this for *Idolatry*? Where there is an antecedent Ground for *Civil Worſhip* and *Reſpect*, which is well known and underſtood among Men, there is nothing like *Idolatry*, although we do uſe the ſame External Acts towards Men, which we uſe towards God himſelf. As among the *Iſraelites*, no Man doubted that their *bowing to the King* was upon a *quite different account* from their *bowing to God*; although they *bowed to the King* in a *Place* dedicated to *Divine Worſhip*. And where the *Reaſon* of *Worſhip* is ſo well underſtood to be of a quite different Nature from that of *Religious Worſhip*, that very *Reaſon* makes a Diſcrimination, beſides the Circumſtances of *Time* and *Place*. Which I ſhall make appear from the Caſe of *Naaman* the *Syrian*; whoſe *Bowing* in the *Houſe of Rimmon* was therefore free from *Idolatry*, becauſe of the known Cuſtom of paying Civil Reſpect every where elſe to his *Prince* in that manner, and by his publick Proteſtation againſt the *Idolatrous Worſhip* there performed, as *T. G.* ſhews at large from Dr. *H.*

Dial. p. 486, &c. *T. G.* therefore very much miſtakes Dr. *St.*'s meaning, if he thinks he aſſigned the *Diſcrimination* of Acts of *Religious* and *Civil Worſhip* barely to the Circumſtances of *Time* and *Place*, without taking in the *Object* and *Reaſon* of *Worſhip*.

Dial. p. 484. *R. P. But from hence it appears, that Bowing in the Houſe and Preſence of an Idol, and in the very time of Worſhip, is not Idolatry*: For then *Naaman* could not be excuſed.

*P. D.* Where the Worſhip is known to be given not to the *Idol*, but to the *Prince* to whom it is acknowledged to be due elſewhere, Dr. *St.* never ſuppoſed ſuch an Act of Worſhip, though done in an *Idol-Temple*, to be *Idolatry*.

*R. P.*

*R. P. But suppose Men should ask a Bishop Blessing in a Church, and at Prayer-time*, this is not Civil Worship, and is this *Idolatry* ? Dial. p. 483.

*P. D.* Worship may be said to be *Civil* two ways;

1. When it is performed on a *mere Civil Account*, as it is to *Magistrates* and *Parents*.

2. When it is performed on the account of a *Spiritual Relation*, as in the respect shewed to *Bishops* as *Spiritual Fathers*. The *Worship* is of the same kind with that which is shewed to *Natural Parents*, but the *Relation* is of another kind; on which account it may be called *Spiritual Respect*; but it is in it self an Act of *Civil Worship*, arising upon a Moral Relation, which being of a different Nature from that which is between Princes and Subjects, and Parents and Children; and being founded upon Religious Grounds, may be said to be *Religious* or *Spiritual Respect*, rather than *Worship*.

*R. P. If the first Christians had upon their Knees in time of Prayer begged St.* James *his Benediction, had this been an unlawful Act of Worship* ?

*P. D.* If they were upon their Knees in Prayer to God, I think it was a very unseasonable time to ask their *Bishop Blessing*, although the Act in it self were lawful.

*R. P. But is not this an Act of the same kind with that of Invocation of Saints in times and places of Divine Worship, when we only pray to them to pray for us* ?

*P. D.* I say again, that is not all You do; for you own their *Patronage*, *Protection*, and *Power* to help you in your Necessities; and your *Prayers* must be understood according to your Doctrines. But suppose you did only pray to them to pray for you, yet (1.) You do it with all the *Solemnity* of *Divine Worship* in the *publick Litanies* of the *Church*, when you are in the Posture of your greatest Devotion. And the *Angel* rebuked no less Man than St. *John*, for using the Posture of Divine Adoration to him. (2.) In Kneeling to a Bishop to pray for us, we suppose nothing that encroaches upon the Divine Excellencies; for we are certain he hears and understands us, and we desire nothing from him, but what is in his Power to do, and is very fitting for us to request from him. But when you pray to Saints, you can have no possible assurance that they do or can hear what you say to them; and so it is a foolish and unreasonable Worship: And when you do it with the same External Acts of Devotion which you use to the Divine Majesty, you take away that Peculiarity of Divine Worship which is due to God, by reason of his Incommunicable Excellencies; and so it is Superstitious and Idolatrous Worship, these two ways:

(1.) As it supposes as *great Excellencies* in Creatures as those did who for that Reason were charged with *Idolatry*. I do not meddle with the Possibility of an intelligent Being disunited from Matter, hearing at such a distance as the *Saints* are supposed to be from us, nor whether *God* may not communicate such Knowledge to them; but that which I insist on is this, I find those charged with *Idolatry* not only in *Scripture* and the *Fathers*, but by the *Church* of *Rome* it self, who professed to worship some inferior *Spirits* as *Mediators* between *God* and *Men*; and such *Mediators* as were never imagined to be *Mediators* of *Redemption*, but barely of *Intercession*, as being believed *to carry up the Prayers of Men, and to bring down help from above*. Now here is no *Omniscience*, or *Omnipotency*, or other incommunicable Excellency attributed to these

*Spirits* ; and all the Addreſſes made to them, was under the Notion of *Mediators* to interceed for them , *i. e. to pray to them to pray for them*; and yet theſe were charged with flat Idolatry. It were eaſy to make it appear from unqueſtionable Teſtimonies , that the Heathen Idolaters did worſhip inferior Spirits only as *Mediators*, (as *Apuleius* expreſſes it, *inter cælicolas terricolaſq; vectores hinc precum inde donorum* , wherein he only interprets *Plato*'s Senſe ) and that this was one of the moſt common and univerſal kinds of Idolatry ; and therefore I would fain know why they muſt be charged with *Idolatry*, and you eſcape ? Either be juſt to them, and vindicate the Heathen Worſhip, or elſe you muſt condemn your own.

Dial. p. 467. (2.) *T. G.* confeſſes, *that by the Law of Nature there ought to be ſome peculiar external Acts appropriated to the Worſhip of God as moſt agreeable to his incommunicable Excellency* : Now among all Mankind no one external Act of Worſhip hath been ſuppoſed more peculiar to the Divine Nature than *ſolemn Invocation* in Places and Times appropriated to Divine Worſhip ; but the *Invocation* practiſed in the *Roman Church* hath all the Solemnity and Circumſtances of Divine Worſhip , and therefore it is robbing God of the peculiar *Acts* of his *Worſhip* which is Idolatry. And he muſt be very dull indeed, who cannot diſtinguiſh this *Invocation* from *a caſual or accidental meeting with a Biſhop at Church and kiſſing the Hem of his Garment, or asking his Benediction on ones Knees.*

Dial. p. 485, &c. P. 490. *R. P. But where there are different Objects in themſelves , and a publick Profeſſion and Conſent that thoſe Acts are applied to thoſe Objects upon different Accounts ; it is intolerable Impertinency to underſtand ſuch Acts as are in themſelves equivocal in any other Senſe than the Church declares* , viz. *as applied to Saints or Images ; the outward Acts of Worſhip, as bowing, kneeling*, &c. *are uſed only as Tokens, or Expreſſions of an inferior Reſpect and Veneration.*

*P. D.* If this be all you have to ſay for your ſelves, the *Heathens* muſt be excuſed from *Idolatry* as well as *You.* For they acknowledged by *common Conſent and publick Profeſſion* a difference betwen the *ſupreme God* and *inferior Spirits* ; they allowed of *different Degrees of Worſhip* ; and without all Queſtion did not look on their *Emperors*, as the *Supreme Deity that made and governs the World*, and yet I hope the primitive Chriſtians were not guilty of *intolerable Impertinency* in charging them with *Idolatry.* But it ſeems the holy Angel was guilty of the ſame *intolerable Impertinency* in ſo raſhly rebuking the *Apoſtle* for *falling down to worſhip him* ; for this was *an equivocal Act*, and in all probability was intended only as a token of *Reſpect* and *Veneration* inferior to what was thought *due to God over all, Bleſſed for evermore.* But thoſe Acts of Divine Worſhip which by the Law of God become due only to himſelf, can by no *Conſent* or *Declaration of a Church* be made lawful to be given to any Creature, however they may call them *Acts* of *inferior Reſpect and Veneration* ; as long as they are of the ſame Nature with thoſe which were condemned both by the *Scripture* and *Fathers* as *Idolatrous Worſhip.*

Dial. p. 486, &c. *R. P. Doth not Dr.* Hammond *ſay that* Naaman *the* Syrian *was excuſed from Idolatry, becauſe of the Publick Profeſſion he made, that he intended not the Worſhip to the Idol, but to his Maſter* ? *And will not the ſame Plea hold for us who declare we do not give Sovereign Worſhip to any Creatures, but only inferior Worſhip ?*

*P. D.* If

*P. D.* If *Naaman* had desired leave to worship *Rimmon* or *Saturn* with an *inferior Worship*, declaring that he did not take *Saturn* for the *true and supreme God*, but the *God of Israel*; and therefore he might apply the *same Act* after a *different manner*, and the *Prophet* had then bid him *Go in Peace*, You had some Reason for your Parallel. But as long as *Naaman*'s Question only related to the performing an Act of *Civil Worship* to his *Prince* in the *House* of *Rimmon*, what colour can be hence taken for giving any kind of *Religious Worship* to *Saints* or *Images* in Places and at Times set apart for *Divine Worship*?

*R. P. But* Monsieur Daillé *saith, that external Signs whether of Nature or Religion are to be interpreted by the publick and common Practice of those who use them, and not by the secret and particular Intentions of this or that Person.* Dial. p. 488.

*P. D.* And what then I beseech you? *Monsieur Daillé* discourses against those who would use all the External Acts of Adoration of the Host which others did, but with a different Intention, and hoped this would excuse them from *Idolatry*. Now in this Case he saith, That *Signs of Religious Worship, as uncovering the Head, kneeling or prostrating the Body at the sound of a little Bell, and such other Actions, are the plain and ordinary Signs of the Adoration of the Host; and are so appointed by the Church of* Rome, *and so understood by those who generally practise it; therefore*, saith he, *Those who do use these outward Signs, are to be understood to give Adoration to the Host.* From whence it follows, that Men cannot comply with others in the *Acts* of *Adoration* of the *Host*, without *Hypocrisy* or *Idolatry*; which it was *Mons. Daillé*'s Design to prove. But what is all this to the proving that *Inferior Worship* is not *Idolatry*? We desire that these Signs of Worship may be interpreted according to the *common* and *publick Practice of those who use them*; by which we say, it is as truly *Religious Worship*, as the *Nations* used, which all *Christians* do charge with *Idolatry*. But if your meaning be, that your Actions are to be interpreted in your own Sense, it will come to this at last, that You are not guilty of Idolatry, because you *declare* you are not guilty of it: And who ever condemned themselves for it by *publick Declarations*? unless it were when they repented of it as a great Sin, which I do not find you are yet willing to do. I pray remember this saying of *Daillé*'s, when you think to justify giving Acts of Divine Worship to a Creature, by your *secret Intention*; for he saith, and you seem to approve his saying, *that such Acts when they are of the Nature of Religious Worship, are to be interpreted by the common and publick Practice, and not by particular Intentions*; if therefore the *Acts* of *Worship* be such, as by the *Scriptures*, and Sense of the *Primitive Church* belong only to God, no *Intention* of yours of applying them after an inferior Manner can excuse you from giving Adoration to a Creature: Especially if they be such Acts which *God* hath *appropriated* to himself, as the six mentioned by Dr. *St.* for who dares alter what God himself hath appointed?

*R. P. I think you are turning Quaker, for this is their Principle; do not they alledge Christ's Precept against Swearing, and then say, who dares alter what God himself hath appointed?* Dial. p. 492.

*P. D.* I may as well fear you are renouncing Christianity; for what Christian ever said or thought otherwise, than that it is not in the power of Men to alter the Laws of *Christ*? If Christ's Precept were to be understood of all kind of Swearing, do you really think it would be law-

ful to swear at all? I am ashamed of this loose, not to say, prophane way of talking about the Obligation of Divine Laws.

*R. P. I only mentioned this by the by, to let you see what kind of Principles the Dr. makes use of to combate the Church of* Rome.

*P. D.* Just such Principles as all *Christians* own; and are bound so to do by their being *Christians*. But do you think in earnest, that it is in the Power of Men to alter the Laws of God?

Dial. p. 493. *R. P.* No. But *T. G.* means, *that there is now no Law of God binding Men concerning these external Acts of Worship; and therefore it is in the Power of the Church to appoint these as well as other Rites and Ceremonies, and to determine the Signification of them.*

*P. D.* If this be his meaning, it is very ill expressed. But I say, that our Saviour hath declared the immutable Obligation of that Law concerning applying all *Acts* of *Religious Worship* only to *God*; and that the *Universal Church* of Christ in the first Ages so understood it; as appears not barely by their words, but by the greatest Testimony of their Actions; when such Multitudes laid down their Lives upon this Principle. Therefore I say again, You must call in question their *Title* to *Martyrdom*, or you must own this for a True Christian Principle.

Dial. p. 494, &c. *R. P. But we declare our meaning in those which Dr.* St. *calls appropriate Acts of Divine Worship, when we apply them to any Creatures, to be only to use them as Tokens of inferior Respect and Veneration: As Invocation, Building of Temples and Altars, burning of Incense, making of Vows,* &c.

P. 497. *But that which God hath forbidden is, that we shall not use them to any besides himself, as tokens of that inward Submission of our Souls which is proper to him.*

Dial. p. 493. *P. D.* Did not you say, *that the Appropriation of these Acts by the Law of* Moses, *being taken away by the ceasing of that Law, they are now to be looked on as indifferent Rites and Ceremonies*?

*R. P.* And what then?

*P. D.* Did that Law cease at the coming of Christ, that those Acts were to be used only to *God* as tokens of that inward Submission which is proper to him?

*R. P.* No; that doth never cease.

*P. D.* But this you say was the Sense in which *God* did appropriate them to himself; and therefore the *Appropriation* doth still continue.

*R. P.* I suppose *T. G.*'s meaning is, that the *Appropriation* before extended to them as *tokens of inferior Respect and Veneration*, which Law ceasing, it is now lawful to use them in that Sense.

*P. D.* Then these *Acts* under the Law, were forbidden in that Sense, whatsoever *Profession* or *Declaration* were made by those that used them. As suppose that the *Jews* had invocated *Saints* and *Angels* in their *Temple* or *Synagogues*, and worshipped *Images* just as you do, and made the same Professions of their Meanings and Intentions as your *Church* doth; this had been *Idolatry* in them, but not in you. Is this his meaning?

*R. P.* I suppose it must be.

*P. D.* Then *Inferior Religious Worship* was once Idolatry, but it ceased to be so at the coming of Christ. Is not this a rare Invention? And by this means Christ destroyed Idolatry, not by *rooting it out*, but by making that *not to be Idolatry* which was so before: And so he might take away all other Sins by making those *Breaches* of the other Nine Commandments not to be Sins to *Christians*, which were so to the *Jews*.

But

But we have not only the expreſs Words of Chriſt, making all *Religious Worſhip* of a *Creature* unlawful, againſt this Invention, but the *Doctrine* of the *Apoſtles*, who charged the *Gentiles* with *Idolatry*, without regarding this Diſtinction, who were not under the Law of *Moſes*; and the *Conſent* of the *Chriſtian Church* which judged this *Inferior Religious Worſhip* to be *Idolatry* ſtill. And if this be all you have to ſay, it is impoſſible to clear your ſelves from the Charge of *Idolatry*, notwithſtanding all your Meanings and Intentions.

*R. P.* I have one thing yet more to ſay, viz. *That Chriſt appropriates the Titles of Good, Father, and Maſter, to God, and yet we apply them to Men in a different Senſe; and why may we not do the ſame in Equivocal Acts of Worſhip?* Dial. p. 498.

*P. D.* Our Saviour's Deſign was to deter Men from aſſuming or affecting ſuch Titles of Excellency, Superiority, or Authority over others in teaching, as ſeemed to encroach too much on the Divine Perfections: But this holds much more againſt the Pretence of *Infallibility* in any Perſon, than for the Lawfulneſs of *Inferior Religious Worſhip*. For *Chriſt* never forbids the common Uſe of thoſe Titles among Men, when they have no Reſpect to Divine Matters; no more than he doth the *Acts* of *Civil Worſhip* in Men towards *Magiſtrates* or *Parents*: And thus far the Parallel is good, as to *Words* and *Actions*. But as Chriſt doth forbid the *Affectation* of *Infallibility*, tho' of an *Inferior Sort*, under the Titles of *Rabbi*, *Father*, and *Maſter*; ſo he doth likewiſe all *Inferior Sort of Religious Worſhip*, when he ſaith, *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve.* And therefore the *Equivocation*, which lies in Mens power to determine, is not that of the Degrees of *Religious Worſhip*, but of the *Acts* of *Civil* and *Religious Worſhip*. But if it be lawful to apply the Signification of External *Acts* of Worſhip to higher or lower Degrees, why may ye not do the ſame as to *Sacrifice*, as well as *Invocation*, &c.

R. P. *This is a Scruple which hath troubled the Doctor's Notions from the Beginning*; But *T. G.* gives two Anſwers to it. 1. *That Sacrifice, in general, is both by the Cuſtom of the Church, and the Conſent of all Mankind (as* St. *Auguſtine teaches) appropriated to ſignify the abſolute Worſhip due only to God.* 2. *For the particular Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Chriſt, the Nature and Dignity thereof requireth that it be offered to God alone.* Dial. p. 500, 502.

*P. D.* I am ſorry to ſee you diſſemble the Force of the Doctor's Argument, when you pretend to give an Anſwer to it. For he ſaith, that St. *Auguſtine* joins *Adoration* and *Sacrifice* together, as *appropriated* to ſignify the Worſhip peculiar to God. How then, ſaith Dr. *St.* comes S. *Auguſtine's Authority* to be quitted for the one, and ſo greedily embraced for the other? What doth *T. G.* anſwer to that? Defence, p. 225.

*R. P.* I do not find he takes notice of St. *Auguſtine*, for any thing more, *than the Conſent of Mankind about Sacrifice.*

*P. D.* Was it not wiſely done? and then to talk a great deal about the Remainder of the Doctor's Diſcourſe, whether Sacrifice of it ſelf doth ſignify Abſolute Worſhip more than Adoration, without taking notice that St. *Auguſtine* joined them together, tho' the Church of *Rome* ſeparates them. And *T. G.* gives no manner of Reaſon why the Antecedent Conſent of Mankind as to one of theſe ſhould not prevail in your *Church* as well as in the other: Which is the main ground according to *T. G.* why *Sacrifice ought ſtill to be appropriated to the peculiar Worſhip of God.* Dial. p. 508.

R. P.

Dial. p. 501. R. P. *What advantage doth the Dr. get, by insisting so much on that question, Why Sacrifice may not be offered to Creatures as well as other External Acts of Worship? For he can only infer from thence, that in such case the Church of* Rome *might possibly have no External Act of Worship appropriated to God, if she have none but Sacrifice; but whilst she hath no such Custom* de facto *as offering Sacrifice to Saints and Images, 'tis manifest he cannot accuse them in that Point of having no External Act of Worship proper to God, or of giving it to any besides him.*

*P. D.* It was to very good pupose that he insisted on that question, on these Accounts. 1. Because either it is in the Power of the Church to appoint appropriate Acts of Divine Worship, or it is not. If it be in the Church's Power, then *Sacrifice* may be as lawfully offered to the Blessed *Virgin*, if the *Church* think fit, as Prayers and Invocations, notwithstanding the *General Consent of Mankind in appropriating Sacrifice to God.* If not, then there is some *Antecedent Reason* why some External Acts of Worship are appropriated to the *Absolute Worship of God*; if so, then all such Acts are appropriated where the *same Reason* holds; whether it be *Divine Institution*, or the *Consent of Mankind* in general, or of the *Fathers* of the *Christian Church*: And consequently, tho' the *Church* of *Rome* may reserve *Sacrifice* to God as *peculiar* to him, yet they may give other Acts of *Divine Worship* to his *Creatures*, which have the same Reason to be appropriated which *Sacrifice* it self hath. 2. Because tho' in Words they seem to appropriate *Sacrifice to God* as a peculiar *Act of External Worship*, yet they do in effect overthrow it by these two Assertions.

1. That its Peculiarity is not as being an *Act of Adoration*, but upon another Account, as a significant *Ceremony* of our *total Subjection* to *God*. And this was that which Dr. *St.* charged your Divines with, that they reserve *no one Act of external Adoration* as proper to God; and that they say, Defence, p. 204. p. 226. that *Sacrifice* doth not *naturally* signify any Worship of *God*, but only by the Imposition of Men. So that your Divines confess there is no *natural Act of Divine Worship*, *no external Act of Adoration* which is reserved as peculiar to God; but only an Outward Ceremony which doth not of it self signify the *Worship of God*, nor our Subjection to him. But Solemn Prayers and Praises do *of themselves* signify our Dependance on *God*, and therefore have an *Antecedent Reason* to the *Consent* of *Mankind*, why they should be appropriated to the *Worship* of *God*.

2. That even *Sacrifice* is allowed by the *Roman Church* to be offered for the Honour of *Creatures*: Which Dr. *St.* saith, is joining Creatures Defence, p. 220, 222 together with God in the Honour of *Sacrifice*: And if *Sacrifice* be so appropriate to the Honour of God that it cannot signify any thing else, then it is Nonsense to sacrifice to God for the Honour of another; if it may signify any thing else, and be so used in the *Church* of *Rome*, then you do not reserve so much as Sacrifice for an appropriate Sign of the Absolute Worship of God.

Dial. p. 519. *R. P. To what miserable Shifts,* saith *T. G. are Men put, when they would have such trivial kind of arguing as this, to pass for solid Reasoning: And it must be a hard World, when a Man of the Doctor's Abilities must be forced to feign, that he doth not know how the same Sacrifice may be a Propitiation for Sins, and a Thanksgiving for Benefits, especially the Sacrifice of the Altar being the same with that of the Cross, in which all the Differences of the Legal Sacrifices were fulfilled.*

*P. D.*

*P. D.* It is a hard World indeed, when such Stuff as this must pass for answering. Dr. *St.* never denied that Thanksgivings might be offered to God in the time of most solemn Worship, for the *Graces* of his *Saints*; nor that the *Circumstances* of *Divine Worship* might redound to their *Honour*, as the Primitive *Christians* offering up their Devotions to *God* at their Sepulchres: But the Question is, Whether it be consistent with the *Appropriation* of *Sacrifice* to the *Honour* of *God*, to offer it up *for the Honour of his Creatures*; especially the *Sacrifice* of the *Altar*, i. e. the *Son* of *God*, as a Propitiatory *Sacrifice for the Quick and the Dead*?

*R. P. Why may not we say, We offer this Sacrifice to God in the Honour of S.* Michael, *to testifie our Application of it in Thanksgiving, for the Favours and Graces bestowed on him*? Dial. p. 521.

*P. D.* I pray consider, (1.) You say, That *Sacrifice in your Church is appropriated to the Honour of God*; (2.) That *Sacrifice doth not signifie the Worship of God of it self, but by Institution, or consent of Mankind.* (3) Then the Intention of *Sacrifice* is to *signifie* that *Honour* which is peculiar to *God*. Now how can it *signifie the Honour due only to God*, if it may *signifie the Honour due to his Creatures*?

*R. P. Is it not for the Honour of a Person to praise God for him? And Sacrificing being the Offer of a Present in Token of Gratitude, doth that diminish or add to the Act of Thanksgiving? And if it be a greater Declaration of Thanksgiving, it must consequently be a greater Declaration also of the Honour of the Person for whom it is offered.* Dial. p. 522.

*P. D.* It is one thing to make the *Graces* of *Saints* an *Occasion* of *Thanksgiving* to *God*, and another to offer up a *Sacrifice for the Honour of the Saints*, as it is expressed in the *Offertory*. In the former Case there is no question but the *Honour* is *designed* wholly to *God* as the *Giver* of those *Graces*, although a *Consequential Honour* doth redound thereby to the *Saints* themselves; but in the latter Case the *intended and designed Honour of the very Act it self* is declared to be to the *Saints* as well as to *God* himself. If a Courtier gives the King solemn Thanks for great Kindness shewed to one of his *Subjects*, the Honour of the *Action* belongs wholly to the *King*, although *Occasionally* and *Consequentially* it redound to the Reputation of the Person for whom it is done: But if a Courtier on New-Year's-Day should make a *Present* to the *King* upon his *Knees*, and *say*, I offer this New-Year's-Gift to Your *Majesty*, *in Honour of Your Majesty*, *and of the Groom of your Stole*, or *Chamberlain of Your Household*, &c. how do you think this would be taken at Court? And yet this is just the *Form* of the *Offertory* in your *Missal*. *We make this Oblation to thee, O Holy Trinity, and for the Honour of the Blessed Virgin, and all Saints*; can any one say that this is not the *designed and intended Honour* which belongs to the *Act* it self, and not merely that which is *Occasional* and *Consequential*? If those who offered *Cakes* to the *Blessed Virgin* had said, *We offer these Cakes to the Honour of the Blessed Trinity, and the Virgin* Mary, had not this been joining them together in the Honour of those Oblations? And is it not the same Case here? Besides, you are guilty of a greater Absurdity; for those might be only *Eucharistical Oblations*, but in your *Sacrifice* of the *Mass*, you pretend to make a *Present* you say to *God*; but what is it? Nothing less than *his own Son*, if your Doctrine be true. And for what end? *To be a Propitiatory Sacrifice for the Quick and the Dead.* And is this indeed *the Present* you make to Almighty God, in Honour of his Saints?

Saints? I cannot with patience think of the Abſurdities which follow from hence. For how came you to make a *Preſent to God* of his *own Son*? When we make a *Preſent* to any one, it is underſtood to be of ſomething in our Power to beſtow, and which we are willing to part with, for his ſake to whom we offer it. Do you intend in this Senſe to make a *Preſent* of the *Son of God* to the *Father*? Have you the *Power* of *beſtowing him* in your Hands? And are you willing *to part with your whole Right and Intereſt in him*? You are excellent Chriſtians the mean while. Nay, no *Sacrifice* was truly and properly offered by any Perſon, wherein he did not abandon his Right in that which was Sacrificed. And therefore you ſee upon what Terms you make ſuch a *Preſent* to God, by a *proper Sacrifice* of his *Son* to him. But ſuppoſe the *Son* of *God* were to be made a *true and proper Sacrifice* for *Sins* on the *Altar*, How comes it into your Hands to offer him up to the Father, ſince the great *Sacrifice* of *Propitiation* was not to be offered by any ordinary *Prieſts*, but by the *High-Prieſt* himſelf, *who was to carry the Blood into the Holy of Holies, and there to make Interceſſion for the People*? Are you the *High-Prieſts* of the *Goſpel*, to offer unto *God* the great *Sacrifice* of *Attonement*? Is not the *great High-Prieſt of our Profeſſion entred within the Vail, and is there making Interceſſion*, by vertue of his *Sacrifice* on the *Croſs*? What need then of your Offering him up again for *Propitiation*, who Offered himſelf once on the Croſs for *a full, perfect, and ſufficient Sacrifice, Oblation and Satisfaction for the Sins of the whole World*? We have all the reaſon in the World to Commemorate with great Thankfulneſs and Devotion, that invaluable Sacrifice of the *Croſs*; and if you will call the *Whole Euchariſtical Office* a *Commemorative Sacrifice* as the Ancients did, I ſhall never quarrel with you about it. But how the *Sacrifice* of the Maſs comes to be *Propitiatory* as the *Sacrifice* on the *Croſs* was, I underſtand not; nor how it ſhould be the ſame with the *Sacrifice* of the *Croſs*, and yet of ſo much leſs value than it, the one being ſaid by you to be *infinite*, and the other *finite*; nor how the *Deſtruction* of his *Sacramental*, and of his *Natural Being*, ſhould be the ſame thing; nor how this *Sacrifice* ſhould be *Propitiatory* only for one *ſort* of *Sins*, and not for another; nor how the Son of God can be made a *true and proper Sacrifice for Sin*, under the *Species* of *Bread* and *Wine*; nor, what *Conſumptive Change* that is in him, which according to your ſelves is neceſſary to make him ſuch a *Sacrifice*. Is he *ſlain* again in the *Maſs*? If he be, I can tell who is the *Judas* that betrays him, and who are the *Jews* that Crucifie him. If not, how comes a *Propitiatory Sacrifice* without *ſhedding of Blood*? If the *Conſumptive Change* be only in the *Elements*, then the *Elements* are *Sacrificed*, and not *Chriſt*. If it be only a *Sacramental Change*, what is that to a *Sacrifice* of *Propitiation*? And ſuppoſe all the other Abſurdities to be removed, and that the *Sacrifice* of the *Maſs* is a *true*, *real*, *proper* and *Propitiatory Sacrifice of the Son of God, Body and Soul upon the Altar*, yet how at laſt comes this to be *giving God Thanks for the Graces of his Saints!* I thought ſuch a *Sacrifice* had been much rather for the *Expiation* of their *Sins*.

*R. P.* I pray Sir forbear; I have no longer Patience to hear you talk at this rate againſt the *Sacrifice* of the *Maſs*; for if you deſtroy that, we are all undone. Methinks, as *T. G.* ſaith, *Dr.* St.'s *Argument againſt it, might have been expected from the Pen of a* Crellius?

Dial. p. 511.

*P. D.*

*P. D.* Of a *Crellius*? Why ſo I pray? He wrote againſt *Chriſt*'s Propitiatory Sacrifice on the *Croſs*; and as I remember, Dr. *St.* hath anſwered his Arguments: How comes he then, of all Men, to *argue like* Crellius?

R. P. *Becauſe his Reaſons againſt the Sacrifice of the Maſs will hold againſt that of the Croſs.*

*P. D.* That would be ſtrange; but let us hear them firſt and then judge.

R. P. *Why, he looks upon it as a monſtrous Abſurdity for us to pretend, firſt to make our God with ſpeaking five Words, then to offer up God himſelf unto God as a Sacrifice, and conſequently to ſuppoſe him deſtroyed, and this all to teſtifie our ſubmiſſion to God.*

*P. D.* And do not you think theſe horrible Abſurdities, and ſuch as can never enter into any Man's Head that is not firſt reſolved to part with his Underſtanding?

R. P. *And do not you think theſe Expreſſions highly injurious to that ineſtimable Sacrifice which Chriſt himſelf offered upon the Croſs.* Dial. p. 509.

*P. D.* Not at all. For, do we believe, that the *Jews* made an ordinary Man to be the *Eternal Son* of *God* by ſpeaking five Words over him? And that the *Jews* then ſlew him and offered up *God*, as a Sacrifice to *God* for the Expiation of Sins; and all this, as an Act of *Gratitude* to *God* for the *Graces* of his Saints? If not, what Colour or Pretence is there, that the laying open the Abſurdity of your *Sacrifice* of the *Maſs*, ſhould derogate from the *Sacrifice* of the *Croſs*?

R. P. *Were not the* Jews *ſcandalized at that moſt in the Sacrifice of the Croſs*, viz. *the Offering of God to God?*

*P. D.* A *crucified Saviour*, or a *ſuffering Meſſias, was to the Jews a ſtumbling Block, and to the Greeks Fooliſhneſs.* But what do you mean by *the Offering up of God to God*, do you think the Divinity was the *Sacrifice*? Or the *Blood* of *Chriſt*, which he being the *Eternal Son of God* did offer up to his *Father*, as a *Propitiation* for the *Sins* of *Mankind*?

R. P. *Might not he be ſaid, to offer up God himſelf to God as a Sacrifice?*

*P. D.* Then you muſt make the *Divinity* the *ſacrifice*; and how can that be a *ſacrifice* which is capable of no Change? But ſuppoſe Chriſt as *God* and *Man* be ſaid to offer up at leaſt a *Divine ſacrifice*; what is all this to your Offering up the *Son* of *God* as a *ſacrifice* to *God* for the *ſins* of the *World*?

R. P. *Might not thoſe*, as *T. G.* ſaith, *who were at the Foot of the Croſs, offer up the Son of God on the Croſs to the Father?* Dial. p. 511.

*P. D.* This is a Piece of *New Divinity*; and far enough, I dare ſay, from arguing like *Crellius*. Who ever thought, that the *Jews* had the ſame Power to offer up the *Blood* of *Chriſt* as a *Propitiatory Sacrifice*, which himſelf had who had Power over his own Life? If *T. G.* argues at this rate, none would imagine he hath ever conſidered the Nature of *Chriſt*'s Sacrifice, ſince he talks ſo unskilfully about theſe Matters.

R. P. *But what doth Dr.* St. *talk of our making and deſtroying God in the Maſs, ſince we belive that the ſame Chriſt who is in Heaven is whole under either Species; and his Blood to be ſeparated from his Body not really, but myſtically only and in repreſentation.* Dial. p. 510.

*P. D.* Do you believe a true, proper Propitiatory Sacrifice in the Maſs, or not?

Seſſ. 22. c. 1. 2. can. 1. 3.

*R. P.* Do not you know the Council of *Trent* hath expreſly defined it, and Anathematized all thoſe who ſay the contrary?

*P. D.* Is there any *true*, *proper Propitiatory Sacrifice*, where there is not a *Conſumptive Change* of that which is *ſacrificed*? And what is that which is *ſacrificed* in the *Maſs*? *Not the Elements, but Chriſt under them*, you ſay: If Chriſt be the *Sacrifice*, he muſt be *ſlain* again at every *Maſs*, as he was once on the Croſs; or you can aſſign no *Deſtruction*, which you ſay is neceſſary to ſuch a *true* and *proper Sacrifice*.

*R. P.* Do not you obſerve *T. G.*'s Words, *That Chriſt is whole under either Species, and his Blood ſeparated from his Body not really, but Myſtically only, and in Repreſentation?*

*P. D.* How is that? *Whole Chriſt under the Bread, and whole Chriſt under the Wine; and the Blood ſeparated from the Body not really, but Myſtically only, and by Repreſentation.* This is admirable Stuff, and true *Myſtical Divinity*. If *the Body of Chriſt doth remain whole and entire*, where is the *true proper Sacrifice*? Where is the *Change* made, if not in the *Body of Chriſt*? If that be uncapable of a Change, how can it be a *true and proper Sacrifice*? If the Blood be not *really ſeparated* from the Body, where is the *Mactation*, which muſt be in a *Propitiatory Sacrifice*? If Chriſt do remain *whole and entire* after all the *Sacrificial Acts*, where, I ſay, is the *true* and *proper Sacrifice*? *T. G.* had far better ſaid, and more agreeably to Scripture, Antiquity, and Reaſon, that there is no *real* and *proper Sacrifice* on the *Altar*, but only *Myſtical*, and by *Repreſentation*.

Dial. p. 512.

*R. P.* But *T. G.* ſaith, *That Religion, which admits no External viſible Sacrifice, muſt needs be deficient in the moſt ſignal part of the publick Worſhip of God.*

*P. D.* I pray remember, it is an *External and Viſible Sacrifice* which you contend for, and now tell me where it is in your Church. Doth it lie in the *Mimical Geſtures* of the *Prieſt* at the *Altar* in *Imitation* of Chriſt on the *Croſs*? If that be it, the neceſſary *Conſumption* of the *Sacrifice* will be no comfortable Doctrine to the Prieſt. Doth it lie in the *Conſecration* of the *Elements* which are *Viſible*? But you ſay, *the Eſſence of the Sacrifice conſiſts in the Change*; and we can ſee no *viſible Change* made in them, and therefore there is no *External and Viſible Sacrifice*. Beſides, if the *Sacrifice* did lie in the *Change of the Elements, after Conſecration into the Body of Chriſt*, then the *Elements* are the thing *ſacrificed*, and not the *Body* of *Chriſt*; for the *deſtructive Change* is as to the *Elements*, and not as to the *Body* of *Chriſt*. Or doth it lie in the *ſwallowing down, and Conſumption of the Species after Conſecration by the Prieſt*? But here likewiſe the *Change* is in the *Accidents*, and not in the *Body of Chriſt*, which remains *whole and entire*, though the *Species* be *conſumed*; and I think there is ſome difference between *changing ones Seat*, and being *ſacrificed*. For all that the *Body of Chriſt* is pretended to be *changed* in, is only its being no longer under the *Species*; but *T. G.* I ſuppoſe will allow it to be *whole and entire* ſtill. Doth it then lie *in pronouncing the Words of Conſecration upon which the Body of Chriſt is under the Species of Bread, and the Blood under that of Wine, and ſo ſeparated from the Body*? But this can leaſt of all be, ſince *T. G.* aſſures us that *whole Chriſt* is under the *Bread* as well as under the *Wine*; and ſo there cannot be ſo much as a Moment of *real ſeparation* between them; and we know how neceſſary for other Purpoſes the Doctrine of *Concomitancy* is. Tell me then where is your *External and Viſible Sacrifice*

which

which you boaſt ſo much of; ſince according to your own Principles there is nothing that belongs to the *Eſſence* of a *Sacrifice* is *external and viſible*, and conſequently your own Church Labours under the *Defect* *T. G.* complains of.

*R. P. But what makes Dr.* St. *ſo bitter againſt the Sacrifice of the Altar, ſince the moſt true and genuine Sons of the Church of* England *do allow it? as Mr.* Thorndyke, *Dr.* Heylin, *and Biſhop* Andrews? *And doth not this rather look like betraying the Church of* England *than defending it?* Dial. p. 513, &c.

*P. D.* I ſee now you are wheeling about to your firſt Poſt, and therefore it is time to give you a ſpace of Breathing. Your great Buſineſs is to ſet us at Variance among our ſelves, but you have hitherto failed in your Attempts, and I hope will do. I do not think any two or three Men, though never ſo learned, make the *Church* of *England*; her Senſe is to be ſeen in the *Publick Acts* and *Offices* belonging to it. And in the *Articles* to which *T. G.* ſometimes appeals; your *Sacrifices* on the *Altar* are called *blaſpemous Figments, and dangerous Impoſtures.* But as to theſe three Perſons I anſwer thus; Articl. 31

1. Mr. *Thorndyke*, as I have ſhewed already, declares againſt the *true proper Sacrifice* defined by the *Council* of *Trent* as an Innovation and a Contradiction. And that which he pleads for, is, *that the Euchariſt is a commemorative and repreſentative Sacrifice*, about which Dr. *St.* would never contend with him or any one elſe: And immediately after the words cited by *T. G.* he adds theſe; *It is therefore enough, that the Euchariſt is the Sacrifice of Chriſt on the Croſs, as the Sacrifice of Chriſt on the Croſs is repreſented, renewed, revived, and reſtored by it, and as every Repreſentation is ſaid to be the ſame thing with that which it repreſenteth.* P. 87, 88. Laws of the Church, p. 40.

2. *Pet. Heylin*'s Words are expreſly only for a *commemorative Sacrifice*, as *T. G.* himſelf produces them; and therefore I wonder what *T. G.* meant in citing them at large: For he quotes the *Engliſh Liturgy* for the *Sacrifice of Praiſe and Thankſgiving*; and S. *Chryſoſtom* calling it *the remembrance of a Sacrifice*; and many of our learned Writers, *a Commemorative Sacrifice.* What is there in all this in the leaſt repugnant to what Dr. *St.* had delivered? *Heylin's* Introd. n. 24.

*R. P. But he quotes Biſhop* Andrews, *ſaying, Take from the Maſs your Tranſubſtantiation, and we will have no difference with you about the Sacrifice.*

*P. D. Biſhop* Andrews calls the *Euchariſt* a *commemorative Sacrifice*, and he ſaith, *it was properly Euchariſtical*, or of *the nature of Peace-Offerings, concerning which the Law was, that he that offered ſhould partake of them*; and a little after follow thoſe Words you mention: To which he adds, *We yield you that there is a remembrance of Chriſt's Sacrifice; but we ſhall never yield that your Chriſt being made of Bread is there ſacrificed.* Which is the very thing that *T. G.* is ſo angry with Dr. *St.* about. And have not you bravely proved that Dr. *St.* hath herein gone againſt the Senſe of the genuine Sons of the *Church* of *England*? If you have any thing yet left which you think material, I pray let us have it now, for fear leſt *T. G.* make uſe of it to ſtuff out another Book. Ad Bell. Apol. Reſp. p. 184.

*R. P.* I think we are near the *Bottom.*

*P. D.* So I imagine by the *Dregs* which came laſt.

*R. P.* There is one thing yet left for a cloſe: Which is, *Dr.* St. *ſaith, ſuppoſing this ſacrifice were allowed, yet this doth not prove that we reſerve* Dial. p. 523.

*any external Act of Worship belonging to all Christians, because this Sacrifice belongs to the Priests only to offer.*

*P. D.* And what answer doth *T. G.* give to that?

*R. P.* He saith, *that nothing is more notorious than that those of the Church of* Rome, *are bound on every Sunday and Holy Day to hear Mass.*

*P. D. To hear Mass!* A very Christian Duty no doubt, especially if they understand never a word of it; and as *Diana* saith, *a Man is not bound to hear a word that is said:* But what then?

Dian. Sum p. 446. Dial. p. 524.

*R. P. By this external Act,* he saith, *they testify the uniting their Intention with the Priest as the publick officer of the Church in the Oblation of the Sacrifice.*

*P. D.* I have often heard of the Skill you have of *directing Intentions*, but I never knew of this knack of *uniting Intentions* before. I know how necessary the *Priest's Intention* is in your Church, but what if the *People* should fail of *uniting* their *Intention* with his, (as they often think and talk of other things at *hearing Mass*) would it not be a *Sacrifice* without the *Union* of their *Intentions?* Suppose the *Priest's Intention* should wander, what would the *Peoples uniting their Intentions* signify towards the *Sacrifice?* You will not say, they have any Power to *offer* the *Sacrifice*; therefore the *Act* of *Sacrificing* belongs only to the *Priests*, whether the *Peoples Intentions be united* or not. If the People first *offered* that which was to be *sacrificed* to the *Priest*, and then he *sacrificed* it in their *Name* (as among the *Jews*) they might be said to have a share in the *sacrifice*; but when the *sacrifice* is supposed to come down from Heaven upon the *Priest's* Words, and he doth not represent the *People* but *Christ* in the *Act* of *sacrificing*, What doth the *Peoples uniting their Intentions* signify to the *sacrifice?* I pray tell me in whose *Name* doth the *Priest* pretend to the *Power* of *Offering* up the *Body* of *Christ* in *sacrifice* on the *Altar*, the *People's*, or *Christ's?*

*R. P. In the Name of Christ doubtless, for the People have no Power to do it.*

*P. D.* If they have *no power* to do it, and all the *Authority* be supposed to be derived from *Christ* for doing it, what doth the *uniting the Peoples Intentions* with the *Priests* signify as to the offering up the *Sacrifice?* You might as well say, that the *Jews* under the *Cross* might unite their *Intentions* to *Christ's* in offering himself on the *Cross* to the *Father*, and so it might become their *Act* as well as *Christ's*. But in my Mind your Phrase of *hearing* and *seeing Mass* is much more proper (if Men were bound either to *hear* or *see*, which your *Casuists* say, they are not) than this of *uniting their Intentions* with the *Priest*, which is absurd and ridiculous. Doth *T. G.* so little consider the *Honour* of the *Priestly Office* as to talk of the *Peoples uniting their Intentions* with the *Priests* in in the *Oblation* of the *Sacrifice?* The next step may be, that the *sacrificing* may depend on the *People's Intentions* as well as the *Priests*; and what a Case are you in then? *Aquinas* and *Cajetan* were much wiser than *T. G.* in this Matter, for they both declare *that this Sacrifice belongs only to the Priests and not to the People*; as Dr. *St.* told *T. G.*

Defence, p. 205.

*R. P. T. G.* saith, *he cannot find the Citation in the place quoted by him; but he dares affirm that* Cajetan *was not so silly a Divine as to deny it to belong to the People to offer the sacrifice by and with the Priest.*

Dial. p. 525.

*P. D.* And

*P. D.* And I dare affirm *Cajetan* was much wiſer than to ſay, that the *Offering* the *Sacrifice* did in any ſenſe *belong to the People*; and ſo much *T. G.* might have found in the Place cited by the Dr. only *Qu.* 86. was put for *Q.* 85. and not as *Cajetan's* bare Opinion, but as the Judgment of *Aquinas* too. He ſaith indeed, *That the Prieſts do offer the Sacrifice for themſelves and others*; but he was not ſo ſilly to imagine that they were *to unite their Intentions with the Prieſts in the Oblation*; but that Expreſſion only ſhews for *whoſe ſake* and not in *whoſe Name* the *Sacrifice* was offered. *For there are other Sacrifices*, ſaith he, *which every one may offer for himſelf*; *and thoſe*, ſaith *Cajetan*, *are ſpiritual Sacrifices of Devotion and Virtue*; *but for the Sacrifice of the Altar, that belongs only to the Prieſts and Officers of the Church.* Cajet. 2. 2. qu. 85. art. 4.

*R. P.* But the very *Maſs-Book* calls it *meum ac veſtrum ſacrificium*; and deſires God to accept it for all thoſe *pro quibus tibi offerimus, vel qui tibi offerunt hoc ſacrificium.*

*P. D.* I will tell you the Myſtery of this Buſineſs, and ſo put an end to this long Conference. It was the ancient Cuſtom of the *Roman Church*, as well as others, for the Communicants to make an *Oblation* of the *Bread* and *Wine* at the Altar, of which they were afterwards to partake. This I prove from the *Sacramentary* of *S. Gregory*, publiſhed by *Pamelius*; where it is ſaid, *while the Offertory is ſinging, i. e.* the Anthem then uſed, *the Oblations are made by the People, and laid upon the Altar that they might be conſecrated.* And the *Ordo Romanus* declares theſe *Oblations* to be the *Bread and Wine: Of which*, it adds, *that the Archdeacon took as much and laid upon the Altar, as would ſerve for the People that were to communicate.* Theſe *Oblations* continued in the *Church* a long time, and were enforced by *Canons* and *Conſtitutions* when the People began to ſlacken in their Devotion. Upon which the *Church* of *Rome* thought fit to bring in the uſe of *Wafers* inſtead of common *Bread*; and ſo theſe *Oblations* grew into Diſuſe, or were turned into Offerings of Money inſtead of them. *Sirmondus* and Cardinal *Bona* have proved beyond all Diſpute, that the ancient *Latin Church* did uſe common and leavened *Bread* in the *Euchariſt* that was offered by the People till a thouſand Years after Chriſt. But then the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation coming into the *Roman Church*, it was no longer thought fit that the *Bread*, which was to be turned into the *Son of God*, ſhould be made after a *common manner*, or with the *unſanctify'd Hands* of the *Laity*, but by thoſe who did attend upon the Altar: Remembring what the good Woman told *Gregory* I. *That ſhe wondred that the Bread which ſhe made with her own Hands ſhould be called the Body of Jeſus Chriſt*; which the People had more reaſon to do, when they came to define the *manner* of the *Preſence*, as they did about this time; altho' it were not made an Article of Faith till afterwards. From hence the Diſpute began between the *Greeks* and *Latins* about *unleavened Bread*; and from henceforward the Cuſtom of *Oblations* for the Service of the *Altar* declined, and is only kept up on ſome particular Solemnities, as *Canonization* of *Saints*, *Inauguration* of *Princes*, *Conſecration* of *Biſhops*, *Marriages* and *Funerals*; however the ſame Form of Words continue ſtill in the *Offices*, as if the *Oblations* of *Bread* and *Wine* were ſtill made by the People; and ſo *Sirmondus* and *Bona* both ſay thoſe Expreſſions of the *Maſs-Book*, you mention, are to be underſtood of theſe *Oblations* of the People, and not of the *Sacrifice* of *Chriſt's Body*. And that theſe *Oblations* were called *Sacrifices*, appears by the known Paſſages of St. *Cyprian*, *Locuples & dives*

Liturg. Lat. to. 2. p. 178.

Caſſandr. Liturg. c. 27.

Concil. Matiſ. c. 50.

Capit. Car. M. l. 6. c. 162. Sirmond. de Azym. c. 2. Bona de rebus Liturg. l. 2. c. 8. Sect. 8.

Joh. Diac. in vit. Greg. c. 41.

Sirm. de Azy. c. 1. Bona de reb. Lit. l. 1. c. 23. Sect. 3.

Cypr. de Oper. & Elemoſyn.

*cs*

*es & Dominicum celebrare te credis, quæ in Dominicum ſine ſacrificio venis, quæ partem de ſacrificio quod pauper obtulit ſumis?* In which he blames the Rich Women that came without an *Oblation*, which he calls a *Sacrifice*, and did partake of that which the Poor offered; which St. *Auguſtin* calls *de aliena oblatione communicare*; and therefore he bids all Communicants to make their own *Oblations* at the *Altar*. But ſuppoſe theſe Expreſſions were not to be underſtood of the *Oblations* of the *People*, (as it is certain the Prayers called *Secreta*, and the firſt part of the *Canon* of the *Maſs* are) yet it was not fairly done of *T. G.* to leave out a very ſignificant Word which immediately followed, viz. *Laudis, qui tibi offerunt hoc ſacrificium laudis.* If the People be allowed their ſhare in the *Euchariſtical Sacrifice* of *Praiſe* and *Thankſgiving*, what is this to their offering up the *proper Propitiatory Sacrifice* of the *Body* of *Chriſt*? I do not deny that the *People* had a *ſhare* in the *Sacrifice*, according to the *ſenſe* of *Antiquity*; not only from their *Oblations*, but becauſe as *Caſſander* well obſerves, the *Ancients* did call the whole *Euchariſtical Office*, as it took in the *Peoples* Part as well as the *Prieſts*, by the Name of a *Sacrifice*; and ſo the *Oblations*, *Prayers*, *Thankſgivings*, *Conſecration*, *Commemoration*, *Diſtribution*, *Participation* did all belong to the *Sacrifice*. But ſince you reſtrain the *true and proper Sacrifice* to the *Oblation* of the *Body of Chriſt* to *God* by the *Prieſt*, Dr. *St.* had reaſon to ſay, that the *Sacrifice* among you belongs to the *Prieſts*, and is not an *External Act of Worſhip* common to all. And ſo according to the *ſenſe* you put on the *Maſs-Book*, you leave no one *Act* of *peculiar External Worſhip appropriated to God, which is to be performed by all Chriſtians*; which was the thing to be proved.

Aug. Serm. 215. de temp.

Caſſand. conſult. de Sacrif. Corp. & Sang. Chriſti.

A

# LETTER

To Mr. *GODDEN*;

Giving a True Account of a

# Late Conference

# At the Deanery of St. *Paul's*.

*SIR*,

I Was very much ſurprized at the ſight of ſeveral Copies you have given out of the Conference between us at my Houſe in *January* laſt. For although you took great Care in the Conference it ſelf to keep me from expecting any great Ingenuity from you after it; yet I could hardly believe you would have ventured ſo far as to have given out ſuch falſe and imperfect Copies of what paſt as all thoſe have been which came to my hands, and were all ſaid to be diſperſed by you. You know very well that the Gentleman who wrote for you never read his Papers in the Concluſion, that we might judge how fairly he had repreſented both ſides. And when they were neither Read, nor Compared, nor Signed as they ought to have been, with what Ingenuity can theſe be diſperſed through ſo many hands for True and Authentick Copies? At leaſt you ought to have ſent them to me and to have anſwered my Objections againſt them before you had read them in *Coffee-houſes*, and made ſuch Deſcants upon them in places where you were ſure I would not be preſent to contradict you. But when nothing was done to make your Copy appear to be good, they muſt be of very eaſy Faith and Underſtanding who would take your word in this matter, without ſo much as any *Motives of Credibility*.

I hear you made great Boaſts of your Victory after the Conference, which I only ſmiled at, and thought you hoped to make your ſelf conſiderable by your Vanity. If you gain no greater Victories, you will very little increaſe the Number of your Converts: For the Gentleman, for whoſe ſake the Conference was, declared immediately after it, *that he was much more confirmed in the Communion of our Church by it, and reſolved to continue in it*; which he hath ſince repeated ſeveral times to me. But of all the Perſons of your Church, I have yet met with, you had leaſt Reaſon to go away with the boaſt of a Victory.

For I pray, call but to mind how the Conference ended, and I think you will be aſhamed of your boaſting. When you came to your Demonſtration of Infallibility in the Church of *Rome*, which came to this in ſhort, *That all Traditionary Chriſtians believe the ſame to day which they did*

*did yesterday, and so up to the time of our Blessed Saviour, and if they follow this Rule they can never err in Faith, therefore are infallible: And you proved they could not innovate in Faith unless they did forget what they held the day before, or out of Malice alter it.* I thought the best way to shew the Vanity of this rare Demonstration was to produce an Instance of such as followed Tradition, and yet you could not deny to have erred, and that was of the *Greek Church*, which went *upon Tradition from Father to Son*, as much as ever the *Roman* did: And I desired to know of you whether the *Greek Church* notwithstanding, did not err in Matters of Faith; And if it did, then a Church holding to Tradition was not infallible. Your answer was, *That the* Greek *Church followed Tradition, till the* Arians *left that Rule and took up a new one*, i. e. *Scripture privately interpreted.* I told you I did not mean the *Arians*, but the present *Greek Church* (which you charge with Heresy) and yet they follow Tradition from Father to Son. This I was forced to repeat over and over, but no Answer could I get from you, but you still run back to the *Arians*, and compared them and the *Calvinists*, which I told you was not at all to the purpose; for I insisted upon the present *Greek Church*, and so you rose up in a heat, and endeavour'd to keep those who wrote from setting down this last part as it ought to have been.

In the Papers dispersed by you, you make me barely put the Question, *Whether the* Greek *Church did follow Tradition from Father to Son in Matters of Faith or no?* But do not mention the Inference I drew from it, and which is set down in the Original Paper that was read aloud and approved by both Parties, *That if the* Greek *Church followed Tradition*, which is undeniably true, and is granted by your self in your Answer, *then a Church holding to Tradition as its Rule may err in Matters of Faith*, which unavoidably overthrows your pretended Demonstration. For you cannot make an evasion, by saying, *That though the* Greek *Church once adhered to Tradition, yet in the Time of* Arianism *it left that Rule and took up another, and so ever since fell into Error as the* Calvinists *did*; for that is apparently false as to the present *Greek Church* (of which I spake) as is known to every one that knows any thing of the *Greek Church*, which in all its Differences with the *Roman Church* as to the *Procession of the Holy Ghost*, *the Pope's Supremacy*, *Purgatory*, &c. still pleaded Tradition and adhered to it. Neither is so much of your Answer true, as that even the *Arians went off from the Rule of Tradition*, for they insisted on it, and *Petavius* thinks they had good Reason for it. But however, I said my Instance was not about them, but the present *Greek Church*, and this I do affirm, you gave no Answer at all to.

I know what Arts have been used to get Mr. *T.* to approve your Copy: I have not seen what he wrote, and I desired him to bring the Gentleman to me who wrote for you, that we might compare ours together; but word was left with my Servant, *that he was not well.* But suppose he should now correct his Copy, this will be too late for my Vindication, since so many imperfect ones have been given out and dispersed, not only here in Town, but over several parts of the Nation. And therefore I am forced to take this way to put a stop to such disingenuous Proceeding. I hear Mr. *M.* pretends *that I gave out false Copies*, which is so far from being true, that I was often solicited on the Account of your Papers, before I let one be seen, and then it was only to correct the Errors of yours. And mine was taken by a Person of Learning as well as Integrity, who was present at the whole Conference,

ference and very well underſtood the whole matter. But becauſe your Writer's Copy was not then read, and none ſigned, I deſire you now to make good theſe two things, which the whole Conference depended upon.

(1.) That we have no *abſolute Certainty* as to the Rule of our Faith, *viz. the Scripture*; although we have a larger and firmer *Tradition* for it, *viz. the Conſent of all Chriſtian Churches*, than you can have for the Points of Faith in difference between us.

(2.) That the Tradition from Father to Son is an infallible Conveyance of Matters of Faith, notwithſtanding the *Greek Church* is charged by you with Error, which adhered to Tradition.

If you give a ſatisfactory Account of theſe two things, you will acquit your ſelf much better than by boaſting in *Coffee-houſes*, and diſperſing ſuch Copies of Conferences. If you decline giving an Anſwer to this juſt and neceſſary Vindication of my ſelf, the World will eaſily ſee on whoſe ſide the Victory lay; but I confeſs I did not think it worth *boaſting of*.

If you are really ſuch a Man at *Controverſy*, as I hear you would be taken for, I offer you a fair Opportunity to ſhew your ſelf: And I do promiſe by God's Aſſiſtance to return an Anſwer to you in ſuch a manner, as will be leaſt liable to the Injury of *Falſe Copies*.

*I am,*

*SIR,*

March 7. 168$\frac{6}{7}$.

*Your Humble Servant,*

*E. S.*

A

# Second LETTER

## To Mr. *GODDEN*,

### In Answer to Two LETTERS lately Published concerning the CONFERENCE at the Deanery of St. *Paul's*.

*SIR*,

YOU may wonder that I continue my Application to your self, when two Gentlemen have appeared in Print so lately for You; but the Character they give of You is so extraordinary, that I have no mind to change my Man; and therefore hope you will at last generously undertake the Defence of your own Cause. The Author of the first Letter, saith, *Those that know you better think there is not an honester Man in the Nation, and that if you have wronged me it is the first wrong you ever did in your Life.* I am afraid some will suspect your Friend was not in earnest when he wrote this; and that it rather looks like libelling *the Nation* than commending You. But because it is so rare a thing to meet with a Person set forth with such Advantage; you cannot blame me for desiring to hold a Correspondence with You in the way of Letters. For all Mr. *M.*'s Arguments for *Verbal Conferences* have not prevailed upon me; and therefore I proceed in Writing to You, looking on this Way as much freer from sudden Heats and Surprizes, more cautious and deliberate, and less liable to Cavils and Misrepresentations. And methinks the Account Mr. *M.* gives of our Conference, confutes all his Arguments; unless they be better managed in *Coffee-houses* and other Places, *i.e.* with more Temper and Fairness, than he represents ours to have been.

The Truth is, the Experience I have had of the Disingenuity both in and after them, hath made me not very fond of them. But it may be *Verbal Conferences* are most agreeable to *Oral Tradition*; but we who prefer a Written Rule as far more certain, rather chuse to publish in Writing the Sense of our Minds, than leave it to the Arbitrary Representing of others Words.

Which I had suffered so much by, that I was forced for my own Vindication to betake my self to Writing a former Letter to you, wherein I complained of the Injury done me by false and imperfect Copies of our Conference dispersed by you. *If that were the first Wrong you ever did in your Life*, I am very sorry you should begin with me. For after all that your Friends have said for you I am still of the same Opinion. And in this Letter shall more fully give you my Reasons.

But

But I hope you are not now *one hundred and fifty Miles off*, lest I be told again *that I take advantage of your great distance*, as though I durst not write to you at a less distance than between *L.* and *Ch.* But in case you were there still, am I the less injured by your going so far? Or less obliged to vindicate my self among those who had been abused by false Reports and Copies of the Conference?

I now apply my self to what Mr. *M.* hath said for you in Answer to my former Letter.

Mr. *M.* saith, p. 5. *You were far from making great Boasts of a Victory after the Conference.* Must I rely on Mr. *M.*'s Authority, against *the Infallibility of Oral Tradition*? The matter of Fact was deliver'd to me from several Persons who themselves heard you, and in several Places. What must I now believe according to your *Infallible Rule of Oral Tradition*? Here are several Witnesses of unquestionable Credit, who had it (not by a long *Series from Father to Son*, but) immediately from your own Mouth; *who could not easily forget what they heard you say, and would not out of Malice alter it*; and yet your own Advocate declares expressly contrary to them, and thinks I am bound to believe his Testimony against them all. I pray, Sir, consider what a Reflection this is upon your *Rule*, and what little Security we can have for our *Faith* then, by *Oral Tradition*. If so many Persons who were competent Judges of what they heard themselves, and whose Testimony I had no reason to suspect, could so strangely deceive me, at so little a Distance, what Infallibility can you pretend in bare Tradition of Matters of Faith, when the things themselves are so much harder to conceive and deliver entire, and the distance so very much greater? Either therefore you must renounce your Advocate if you hold to the Infallibility of Oral Tradition; or if you hold to Mr. *M.* you must renounce your Rule of Faith.

Mr. *M.* seems to deny the Charge of your giving out *false and imperfect Copies* of the Conference. But that which I charged you chiefly with, was from one that was received from your own Hands; and the Rest I saw afterwards agreed with it. And yet Mr. *M.* cannot deny that the Copies given out contained *lame and unfinished Discourses*, p. 5. *that the Noise and Wrangling might hinder the Writers from being so exact*, p. 15. *that we parted in so great a hurry, that those things which were spoken were not written, nor some, perhaps, of what was written, so nicely exact*, &c. p. 19. *that in the latter part of this Dispute, Things were not set down so exactly as they ought to have been*, ibid. *that the Disputations of the Conference are lame and imperfect*, p. 25. These being the Words of your own Advocate, had I not just cause to complain that such Copies should be dispersed abroad, as a *true Account of the Conference* between us; whereas himself confesses them to have been so *lame and imperfect*? And yet these were given about with great Industry and Care, as tho' an entire Account of what passed at the Conference, were contained in them; and few Days passed, but I heard great Boasts were made of this Conference, and some said, *That they had it under my Hand that I was baffled.*

I think therefore, I had reason to complain, of *imperfect Copies*, since Mr. *M.* confesses they were no better. But this is not all, for I had said the Copies I had seen were *false* as well as *imperfect.*

To make out this Charge I must insist on some Particulars, as they are in that Copy which was given by your self.

When Mr. *T.* declared himſelf ſatisfied as to the Grounds of Faith, without the *Roman* Churches Infallibility, which was the true State of the Queſtion debated in the firſt part (of which more by and by,) He deſired to know for his own Satisfaction, *How you would prove the Church of* Rome *to be infallible*? This in your Copy is ſaid to be put by me. And leſt this might be thought a mere caſual Miſtake, I am certainly informed that Mr. *M.* told a Gentleman to whom he gave a Copy, that I propoſed the Queſtion about the Church of *Rome's* Infallibility (as though I did it on purpoſe to divert the Diſcourſe) whereas Mr. *T.* declaring himſelf ſatisfied with the Anſwers given about *the Grounds of our Certainty*, deſired that he might propoſe a Queſtion to you, *How you could prove the Church of* Rome *to be Infallible*? And in a Copy ſent from *Ch.* where you diſperſed it, the Title of the Second Diſpute is, *Stillingfleet's firſt Queſtion, How do you prove*, &c. ſo that my Name was here falſly put in; and it is eaſy to gueſs with what Deſign. But to proceed.

When you ſaid *the Infallibility of the Church of* Rome *conſiſted in following the Univerſal Teſtimony of all Traditionary Chriſtians*:

Your Copy makes me ask a very wiſe Queſtion upon it, *viz. How does it appear that the Church of* Rome *is Infallible in Tradition*?

Whereas I put Two Queſtions to you.

(1.) *How does it appear that the Church of* Rome *is Infallible in the Senſe and Meaning of Tradition?*

(2.) *Is this Tradition a Rule of Faith diſtinct from Scripture?*

The Deſign of which Queſtions was to ſhew;

(1.) That to receive a Doctrine by mere Tradition, can afford no Infallible Ground of Faith, unleſs Perſons be aſſured of the true *Senſe* and *Meaning* of the Doctrine ſo delivered. As for inſtance, ſuppoſe the Doctrine delivered be *that Chriſt was the Son of God*; if the Infallibility of Tradition goes no farther than the bare Delivery from Father to Son, then Faith can go no farther than general Words, tho' an Heretical Senſe may lie under them. If the Infallibility doth extend to the Senſe and meaning of theſe Words, then either every Traditionary Chriſtian is to give this Senſe, which will make a very large Infallibility in the whole Body of Traditionary Chriſtians, or elſe the Explaining the Senſe and Meaning of Tradition, muſt belong to a certain Order of Men, by virtue of a Divine Promiſe. If ſo, then the Infallibility of Tradition cannot conſiſt *in holding the ſame Doctrine to day that was delivered yeſterday, and ſo up to the time of our Bleſſed Saviour*, as you aſſerted. For, if the Church may explain the Senſe and Meaning of Tradition, ſo as to oblige Men to believe that by virtue of ſuch Explication which they were not obliged to before, then it is impoſſible the Infallibility of Tradition ſhould lie in a conſtant Tradition from Father to Son. For they have no Power to oblige to any more than they received: But according to the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome* (and ſome will tell you, it is Hereſy to deny it, and I appeal to *F. Warner* if it be not) the Church hath Power and Authority to explain the Senſe and Meaning of Tradition; ſo as Perſons are obliged upon Pain of Damnation to believe that Senſe and Meaning of Tradition which the preſent Church delivers. As will appear by an undeniable Inſtance. The Tradition of a Real Preſence in the *Euchariſt* is allowed on all hands; but all the Controverſy is, and hath been for ſome Ages, what the Senſe and Meaning of this Tradition is? Whether it be a Real Preſence by way of Efficacy and Influence, or by a Myſtical Union, or by a Sub-

*v.* Hæreſ. Blackloän.

Substantial Change of the very Elements into the Body and Blood of Christ. The Tradition of the real Presence may be preserved under every one of these Explications: The Question now is, Whether it be sufficient to adhere to the General Tradition of the Church? Or, it be not necessary to Salvation to adhere to the Church's Explication of the Sense and Meaning of this Tradition in the Councils of *Lateran* and *Trent*? If it be said, *That the Sense and Meaning of this Tradition as there expressed* (viz. *Transubstantiation*) *was always deliver'd from Father to Son*: I answer, 1. This is more than is pretended by many of the greatest Men in the *Roman* Church, as hath been lately abundantly shewed. And it is impossible to make it out, that the manner of the Presence hath been constantly deliver'd from Father to Son from the time of Christ and his Apostles; for the main Testimonies alledged out of Antiquity, are only for a Real Presence; and there are as express Testimonies against the Change of the Elements, as there are any for the other. 2. This takes off from the Power and Authority of the Church of *Rome*, if it cannot make a necessary Explication of the Sense and Meaning of Tradition, and resolves all into a mere Human Faith; which is the unavoidable Consequence of this Doctrine of Oral Tradition. For no other Account can be given of it than from mere Natural Reason, *viz. That Traditionary Christians could not believe otherwise to Day than they did Yesterday.* Granting this to be true (which is very far from being so, as shall be shewed, when Your Answer to the Instance of the *Greek Church* comes abroad) yet the utmost that this can amount to is, that I resolve my Faith into a Logical Demonstration. And is this *the Faith* Christians are to be saved by? What *Grace of God*, What *Assistance of the Holy Spirit* are necessary to such a Faith as this? But for this, I refer you to the *Hæresis Blackloäna*, &c.

2. I intended by the second Question to put a Difference between the Tradition allowed by us, and the Tradition disputed. If no more were meant by Tradition than the Universal Tradition of the Christian Church as to the Books of Scripture; this I had before granted to be a sufficient Ground for the Certainty of our Faith as to the Canon of Scripture, which is our Rule of Faith; but if by Tradition be understood, either some necessary Articles of Faith not contained in Scripture, or a Power in the Church to make unnecessary to become necessary; this I denied, and desire to see some better Proof of it than you produce.

All the Answer which you give in your own Paper to these two Questions, is, *That all Traditionary Christians, that is, all Bishops, all Priests, all Fathers, and all People following this Rule, and receiving Faith because it was received the Day before, could not innovate in Faith, unless they could all either forget what they received the Day before, or out of Malice change it; therefore because no Cause can be assigned for such an Effect, they cannot innovate; If there can? Assign it.*

Now to which of the Questions that I put, is this an Answer? Doth this shew that the Church of *Rome* is Infallible in giving the Sense and Meaning of Tradition? Or that this Tradition is a Rule of Faith distinct from Scripture? But it seems to be an Answer to the Question in your Copy; and therefore it is very suspicious, that the Question was so framed, that the Answer might seem pertinent to it.

To

To ſhew the Vanity of this Demonſtration, I produced the Inſtance of the *Greek Church* which followed Tradition from Father to Son, and yet you charge it with Error in Matters of Faith, ſo that a Church following Tradition, may err in Matters of Faith.

Here again your Copy notoriouſly fails, for it makes me put ſuch another wiſe Queſtion as before.

*Whether the* Greek *Church did follow from Father to Son, the Tradition in Matters of Faith, or no?*

As though I had deſired Information from you, whether it did, yea, or no? And that had been all. But I urged plainly that it did, and notwithſtanding you charge it with Error, (nay, with Hereſie;) which overthrows all the force of your Demonſtration, that a Church following Tradition cannot err, when you charge a Church following Tradition with Hereſie.

And is not this ſomething like Falſification, to leave out the whole force and ſtrength of an Argument? And to leave it a very inſipid toothleſs Queſtion?

No, ſaith Mr. *M.* p. 18. *It was only to ſpare a little unneceſſary Pains; for it cannot be imagined he ſhould have any other Deſign in leaving out thoſe Words.*

I do not charge the Gentleman who wrote, with a deſign to falſify, but I cannot excuſe you from diſperſing falſe Copies, in that when you could not but ſee the Notorious Defects of this Copy, you would diſperſe it as containing a true Account of the Conference. Methinks you were very ſparing in the *neceſſary Pains* of Correcting it, before you had read it in Companies for the true Copy, and given it to others to tranſcribe.

As to the Concluſion, Mr. *M.* confeſſes *that it was not diſtinctly ſet down*; but I ſay again, that Copy is falſe in the Concluſion. For theſe are the Words,

[The *Greek Church* followed Tradition from Father to Son] *till they left that Rule, and took up another, and ſo fell into Error as the* Calviniſts *did.*

Here is not one Word concerning the *Arians*, which you cannot but remember that you ran to, and mentioned over and over, when I told you the *Greek Church* did ſtill follow Tradition as her Rule; you ſaid *the* Arians *left the Rule, and interpreted Scripture as the* Calviniſts *did.* I told you again that I meant not the *Arians*, but the *preſent Greek Church*; and I do particularly remember, that I deſired the Gentleman who wrote for you, to put down in his Paper, that it was *the preſent Greek Church* I ſpake of.

I grant, as Mr. *M.* ſaith, p. 19. *that it was not ſet down by your Conſent* any where; for the Truth is, when you found your ſelf pinched by this Inſtance, you grew ſo very uneaſie, that you did all you could to bring things into that Confuſion and Diſorder, which Mr. *M.* mentions. You roſe up in a great heat, and talked a great deal to no purpoſe about *Calviniſts*, &c. for all the ways I could uſe, could not bring you to ſet down any farther Anſwer to the preſſing Inſtance of the *Greek Church*. You confeſſed, *I had raiſed a vaſt Difficulty about it*; but after all, you left no Anſwer behind you to this Difficulty, and I ſtill deſire you to give it.

Mr. *M.* p. 19. *doth ingenuouſly confeſs that this Point was not fully cleared.* No, not in any Meaſure. But he ſaith, *I began with Reproaches.*

I con-

I confess it is a terrible Reproach to tell a Man, he cannot Answer an Argument; but that he makes use of Tricks to avoid it, and that I never met with any that excelled you in that kind. Farther than this, I remember not that I used any Term of Reproach to you. And the only way to wipe off such a Reproach, is to give a fair and Ingenuous Answer; and till that be done, this Reproach will stick.

As to Mr. *T.*'s Slip, in calling the *Greek Church an Universal Church*, methinks you might excuse him for the sake of the *Roman Catholick Church*; which in other Words is the *Roman Universal Church*. And why should not such a Contradiction do as well in *Greek* as *Latin*, since the Patriarch of *Constantinople* had the Title of *Oecumenical Patriarch*?

But this Gentleman cannot escape so; for although Mr. *M.* cannot deny, *that at the End of the first Dispute he declared that he was fully satisfied with my Answers*; (p. 10.) *yet he desires leave to judge how far this Satisfaction of Mr.* T. *was Rational, and what Grounds he had for it.* If Mr. *T.* had been unsatisfied with my Answers, no doubt he had passed for *a Rational and Ingenious Man*; but his Misfortune is, that he could not see Reasons in your Demonstrations; nor the want of it in what I offer'd to prove the Certainty of our Faith, without your pretence to Infallibility.

Therefore to satisfie the World that Mr. *T.* had sufficient Grounds for what he then said, I shall now examine and weigh all the Parts of that Conference, and consider what Mr. *M.* hath said about it.

The Occasion of it is thus set down by him, (p. 2.) *You had affirmed in some Companies, that no Protestant could shew any Ground of Absolute Certainty for their Faith; and that Mr.* T. *had promised you that if I were not able to manifest the contrary, he would forsake our Communion.*

Hitherto Mr. *T.* was a very *rational Man*, because he appeared to doubt of his Religion; and if a little thing had satisfied him; *i. e.* if he had been converted by your Demonstration, he had been more so than ever. But if a Man cannot be convinced by your Reason to change his Religion, who can help it? And yet I very much question whether *F. W.* would absolve any Man who professed to embrace the *Catholick Faith* on your Grounds; which overthrow the Churches Authority in Matters of Faith, and proceed upon *Pelagian* Principles.

*The first thing which was proposed*, saith Mr. *M.* (p. 3.) *and indeed the only Subject Mr.* G. *had any purpose to discourse on was, Whether Protestants had a Ground of Absolute Certainty for their Faith, or not?* Here the Faith spoken of, is that Faith whereby we are Christians, and your Pretence was that without your Infallibility we can have no Absolute Certainty of the Christian Faith, *i. e.* of the Grounds on which we believe the Scripture to contain the Word of God; or all things necessary to be believ'd by us in order to Salvation.

Therefore when the Question was put by you:

Q. 1. *Whether you are absolutely certain that you hold now the same Tenets in Faith, and all that our Saviour taught to his Apostles?*

*A.* 1. My Answer was, *That we are absolutely certain that we now hold all the same Doctrine that was taught by Christ and his Apostles.*

Wherein I plainly distinguish between that Doctrine which Christ by his own Mouth taught his Apostles, and that which the Apostles did by the Spirit of Christ teach the whole Church. The Account I offer'd as to the Christian Faith, was not, as to what Christ taught by an Oral Tradition, (as the *Jews* affirm of *Moses* delivering an unwritten Law)

Law) but I framed my Answer on purpose, to shew that our Faith is not to be resolved into what Christ taught, any otherwise than as it is conveyed to us by the Writings of the Apostles and Evangelists. For the Resolution of our Faith, as to what Christ himself taught, is not to be made into the Words of Christ teaching, conveyed by an Oral Tradition from his Time downwards, but into the Words of Christ as recorded by the holy Writers of the New Testament. And so much I expressed in Answer to the next Question.

Q. 2. *By what certain Rule do you hold it?*

A. 2. *By the Divine Revelations contained in the Writings of the New Testament.*

Here was no Subtilty or Learning requisite, but to give a plain Answer, as to the Rule of our Faith. Which we do assert to be the Written Word, and no Oral Tradition.

Q. 3. Then follow'd, *By what certain Rule do you know that the New Testament, which we now have, does contain all the Divine Revelations of Christ and his Apostles?*

A. 3. *By the Universal Testimony of the Christian Church from the Apostles time downwards.*

In which Answer, I laid down the Grounds of our different Resolution of Faith from that which you contend for; and which I at large explained in the Conference it self; *viz.* that our Certainty of Faith is chiefly resolved into the Testimony of the Apostolical Churches, which first received the Books of the New Testament from the Divine Writers of them; and from these Churches where the Authentick Writings themselves were preserved, Copies were dispersed over other Churches, which by comparing together the Testimonies of the several Churches, did by degrees fix upon the Certain Canon of the New Testament.

Here a Question was started, *Whether all the Books of the New Testament were alike received?*

I answer'd, not at first, but after due Examination those which were at first Controverted, came to be universally received. And I particularly instanced in the *Church of Rome*; which a long time did not receive the *Epistle* to the *Hebrews*, when it was received by other Churches; but at last did yield to the Testimony of other Churches therein. From whence I observed, that the *Church of Rome* was far from being believed then to have the Authority of making the Canon of Scripture, or being Infallible in Faith; it being then taxed for disbelieving a Part of Scripture, and being at last over-ruled by the Testimony of the other Apostolical Churches.

I remember I asked you how it came about that the Church of *Rome* in St. *Jerom*'s time did err about the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, if there were any Infallibility in it?

And your Answer was, *that* Rome *was at a great Distance from* Judea: Which I thought a strange Answer, considering the Communication the Churches then had at greater Distance, and the frequent Recourse of *Jews* to *Rome*; but especially if that Church had any Promise of Infallibility made to it. Which, to be just to you, I do not remember that you once asserted, in all that two Hours discourse. And truly you were not inconsistent with your Principles therein: For Infallibility by Promise and by Oral Tradition are as different as Grace and Nature, or the Assent of Faith from a Dictate of Reason. In Faith a Divine Testi-

Testimony is supposed; in the Infallibility of Oral Tradition nothing but a Natural Principle, *that Men must hold the same Doctrine to day that they did yesterday, and so up to the time of our Blessed Saviour.*

Where the different method of our resolving Faith appears; you begin at the present time, and so run upwards, but the force of all lies in the connexion of one Link with another inseparably; which, I say, will by no means hold; but ours begins with the Apostolical Churches which first received the Sacred Books, and delivered them down; their Testimony is the Authentick Instrument of conveying down the Canon of Scripture, and the following Tradition of the Church is only a conveying down that first Testimony upon which we believe the Canon of the New Testament. There were many interlocutory Passages about this Subject; but this is the Substance of what I distinctly remember.

Q. 4. *Was that Universal Testimony an Infallible Rule, to assure us certainly down to our Time, that the New Testament contained all the Divine Revelations of Christ and his Apostles?*

A. 4. *The Universal Testimony of the Christian Church concerning the Book of Scripture, and the Doctrine contained therein, is a sufficient Ground to make us certain of all Matters necessary to our Salvation.*

To make this Answer clear, we are to consider that the Scripture being our sole and entire Rule of Faith, all Matters necessary to Salvation must be supposed to be contained therein; and therefore the same Testimony which delivers the Scripture to us, doth deliver all the necessary Articles of Faith as contained therein: Which are there received as in the Lump; and if we receive the Book which contains all, we must by the same Authority receive all contained in it. As if a Purse be left to a Man by his Father's Will, full of Gold and Silver, and this by the Executors be declared to contain all the Gold and Silver his Father left him; they who deliver this Purse to him from the Executors, do certainly deliver to him all the Gold and Silver left him by his Father. But if he suspects there was both Gold and Silver left him by his Father which was not in that Purse, then he must call in Question the Integrity of the Executors, who declared that all was contained therein. This is now the Case of the Christian Church, as to all Divine Truths which respect Mens Salvation: The Primitive Church, who answer to the Executors in the other Case, did unanimously declare that all such Truths were undoubtedly contained in the Written Word. Although therefore there may be a real difference in the Nature of the Doctrines therein contained, as there is between Gold and Silver, yet he that receives all, must receive the one as well as the other; and the Matters of Salvation being of greatest Moment, they that receive the whole Will of God upon Grounds of Certainty, must be assured that therein they receive all Matters necessary to our Salvation.

Against my Answer to this Question, Mr. *M.* suggests several things; (*p.* 12.)

(1.) *As to Difference of Translations.* Doth Mr. *M.* think our Faith is to be resolved into the Original Texts? What becomes then of the *Vulgar Latin?* For although the Council of *Trent* declares it to be *Authentick*, yet I take it to be but a *Translation. But there is a difference of Translations, and there is no unanimous Consent of the Christian Church for any one.* And how is it possible there should be, since the Christian Church consists of so many Bodies of Men of different Countries and

Languages? But we have the unanimous Consent of all the ancient Christian Churches, for the Translation of the Scripture into their own Languages; which shews that they thought the People ought to be acquainted with it, as the Word of God so translated, and that they were to resolve their Faith into it, as they were capable of understanding it. And it is very hard to conceive how Faith can be resolved into an unknown Tongue; but we have the unanimous Consent of the Christian Church, that Faith must rest upon the Word of God, which is contained in the Books of Scripture. And therefore we have the Consent of the Christian Church, against resolving Faith into the Infallibility of Oral Tradition. For if this were the Christian Method of Resolving Faith, there would have been very little Use or Necessity of Scripture; and the Fathers were extremely mistaken in the mighty Characters, which on all Occasions they give of it; not only of the Excellency of the Matter contained in it, but as a Rule of Faith for all Christians; as I might easily shew if there were occasion. But I desire to see any thing like the Consent of the Christian Church, from the Apostles time downwards, for resolving Faith into mere *Oral Tradition*: And certainly if the Church had used this way, it must have understood it, and expressed it. And it is a just Prescription against a Method of resolving Faith, that the ancient Christian Church, which consisted (I hope) of True Believers, never knew any thing concerning it; and yet, I suppose, they had *absolute Certainty of their Faith*, though they had *different Translations* of the Bible among them.

(2.) *As to the Number of Books.* I do not deny that there was in the first Ages a difference in several Churches about the Number of Canonical Books; but this doth not hinder that *Universal Testimony* I mentioned: For, (1.) it adds Weight to the Churches Testimony, that where there was any Controversie about any Canonical Book of the New Testament, the Matter was examined and debated, and at last, after a through Discussion the Book was received, as happened about the *Epistle* to the *Hebrews*. Which was not received by the Authority of one Church imposing upon another, but by a fair Examination of Evidence produced for its Apostolical Authority; which being allow'd, it hath been received by the unanimous Consent of the Christian Church. (2.) There hath been ever since an uncontradicted Consent of the Christian Church, as to the Canonical Books of the New Testament. No one Church disputing the Authority of any of them. And even the Council of *Trent* agrees with us herein; although it endeavours to obtrude some Books for Canonical in the Old Testament, which never had the Universal Consent of the Jewish or Christian Church for them.

(3.) *He desires to know, how I understand that all the Divine Revelations are contained in the New Testament*, viz. *Whether all necessary Articles of Faith are contained in the New Testament virtually and implicitly, or clearly and explicitly; the former will do me little service, the latter is contradicted by the Church of* Rome, *and therefore I can plead no Universal Testimony of the Christian Church; and so my Plea for absolute Certainty is groundless.*

To this I Answer,

(1.) If it be agreed that all Doctrines of Faith, necessary to Salvation, are contained in Scripture either *explicitly or implicitly*, (which Mr. *M.* denies not) it is sufficient for my purpose. For the Ground of my Faith is absolutely Certain, *viz.* That all necessary Articles of

Faith

Faith are contained in Scripture: And if they be *explicit*, I am bound to give a distinct Assent to them; if they be not, then no more is required of me than to believe them, when they do appear to be there; which is no more than a general Preparation of Mind, to yield my assent to whatsoever doth appear to me to be the Word of God. So that my Faith rests on the Word of God, as its absolute Ground of Certainty; but the particular Certainty as to this or that Doctrine, depends upon the Evidence that it is contained in Scripture. And it is the *general Ground of Faith* we are now upon, and not the *particular Acts of it.*

(2.) The Church of *Rome*'s assuming to it self the Power of making *implicit Articles to become explicit* by its declaring the Sense of them, doth not overthrow the Certainty of our Faith. For as long as it is granted that all necessary Articles of Faith are there *explicitely*, or *implicitely*, by an Universal Consent of the Christian Church, it signifies nothing to the shaking of my Faith, that a particular Part of the Church doth assume such a Power to it self. For this must come among the particular Points of Faith, and not the general Grounds: It must be looked on as an Article of Faith, and so it must be contained in Scripture either *explicitely or implicitely.* If *explicitely*, we desire to see it in expres Terms, which I suppose you will not pretend to; if only *implicitely*, I pray tell me how I can be explicitely bound to believe such a Power in the Church of *Rome*, which is only implicitely there? And by what Power this *implicite* Article comes to be made *explicite*? For the Power of the Church it self being the Article in question, it is impossible that while it is only *implicitely* there, it should make it self *explicite.* If it be said, *that it will become explicite to any sober Enquirer*, then every such Person may without the Churches help, find out all Necessary Points of Faith; which is a Doctrine I am so far from being ashamed of, that I think it most agreeable to the Goodness of God, the Nature of the Christian Faith, and the Unanimous Consent of the Christian Church for many Ages. But this is beyond our present Business.

(3.) The Church of *Rome* hath no where declared in Council, that it hath any such Power of making *implicite Articles* of Faith contained in Scripture, to become *explicite* by its explaining the Sense of them. For the Church of *Rome* doth not pretend to make *new Articles of Faith*; but to make an *implicite* Doctrine to become *explicite*, is really to make a new Article of Faith. It doth not indeed make a *new Divine Revelation*, but it makes that which was not necessary to be believed, to become necessary; and what is not necessary to be believed, is no *Article of Faith.* What is only believed *implicitely*, is not *actually believed*; but there is only a Preparation of Mind to believe it, supposing it to be made appear to be a Matter of Faith. Besides, the Church of *Rome* declares that it receives its Doctrines by *Tradition*; and although I have often heard of an *implicite Faith*, I know not what to make of an *implicite Tradition.* I had thought whatever is delivered by way of *Tradition*, must be *explicite*; or else *the Father and Son might easily be mistaken:* And so for all that I can see, Mr. *M.* and you must dispute it out; for you say, *That the Infallibility of Faith depends on Oral Tradition, and the Infallibility of Oral Tradition on this, that the Traditionary Christians hold the same Doctrine to Day that was delivered Yesterday in Faith, and so up to the time of our Blessed Saviour.* But what think you now

of Mr. *M.*'s Assertion, *That the Church hath Power to interpret and make known implicite Doctrines contained in Scripture, so as to make it necessary to believe them explicitely?* For he saith, *That all the Churches in Communion with* Rome, *do hold there are Divine Revelations in Scripture, which are contained there virtually and implicitely, so as they need the Churches Interpretation and Authority, for being made known to us.* Let us now lay these Two Assertions together. If your Doctrine hold good, *All Doctrines of Faith must be explcitely delivered from Father to Son:* No, saith Mr. *M. The Church hath Power to make known Doctrines implicite and virtually contained in Scripture.* I pray could the Father communicate to his Son what was only *implicitely* and *virtually* contained in Scripture? If Mr. *M.* says true, here is a very possible Cause of Innovation assigned *without Forgetfulness or Malice*; *viz.* when the Fathers of the Church take upon them to draw forth implicite Doctrines, and to make them explicite Articles of Faith. And thus undoubtedly many Innovations have come into the Church; when some Persons have taken up a particular Opinion, and because nothing would prevail without Scripture, they have attempted to bring it out of Scripture; but that being not plain or clear for it, they gave out it was *virtually and implicitely* contained in it; and thus it passed from one to another, till it getting footing in the Church, and prevailing over a great part of it; then, lest the Church should be charged with Error and Innovation, the prevailing Party takes upon it to declare this to be *the Sense and Meaning of Scripture*, and to require all Persons of their Communion to believe it. And thus Mr. *M.* hath answered your Demonstration. But still, although the Church of *Rome* hath assumed such a Power, yet it still disowned it, and even in the Council of *Trent* pretended *to interpret Scripture according to the unanimous Sense of the Fathers*; which is directly contrary to the Power of making known such *a Sense and Meaning of Scripture* in Doctrines of Faith, as may oblige Men to believe that *explicitely* now, which they were not obliged to, by any precedent Sense or Explication.

I come now to the Fifth and Last Question.

*Qu.* 5. Being the Words *Christian Church* may be taken in several Latitudes by Persons of different Religions, I desire to know what that Christian Church is, whose Testimony concerning the Books of Scripture, and the Doctrine contained therein, is a sufficient ground to make us certain of all matters that are necessary to our Salvation?

*Answ.* 5. By the Universal Testimony of the Christian Church concerning the Books of Scripture which are our Rule of Faith as to matters of Salvation, I mean the Universal Consent of all Christian Churches from the Apostles Times downwards.

This Mr. *M.* calls *Trifling*, (*p.* 13.) and in this you agree, though you differ in the Resolution of Faith. But I pray wherein does this *Trifling* lie? Was it because I would not answer as you would have had me? But I do not yet see how I could have answered more to the purpose. The Question in short was, What the Christian Church was, whose Universal Testimony I relied upon as to the Canon of Scripture? My Answer was, That the Christian Church is that which is made up of all Christian Churches; and their Universal Consent is that Testimony we rely upon. Is this *Trifling*?

But, saith Mr. *M.* (*p.* 14.) *Mr.* G.'s *Intention was to know what Churches I accounted Christian Churches.* I told you over and over, since

we

we were enquiring into the general Grounds of Faith, if we had the Universal Testimony of all Christian Churches, I had no reason to go any farther. For if all Churches of the Christian World be agreed, as they are, about the Canon of the New Testament, this was sufficient for the Certainty of our Faith, without looking after any Infallibility in the Church of *Rome*. And this, you know, was the main Point in Dispute between us; as appears by the occasion of it, as is set down by Mr. *M.* You affirmed, *That no Protestant could shew any Ground of Absolute Certainty for their Faith:* I undertook to shew we had; for our Faith is resolved into the Scripture as the Word of God; and whatever is built on the Word of God, is absolutely Certain: And that these Books of the New Testament contain our Rule of Faith, as being the Word of God, we have the Universal Testimony of all Christian Churches. And this makes our Faith, as to these Books, absolutely certain. And where now is the *Trifling*? Doth the Universal Testimony of all Christian Churches afford sufficient Ground of Certainty as to the Books of Scripture, or not? If not, why do you not shew wherein it fails? If it doth, what mean you to call this *Trifling*? When it is apparent I have gained the Point I aimed at, *viz. That we Protestants have certain Grounds for our Faith, without any need of the* Roman Churches *Infallibility.* Which was the thing to be shewed.

But Mr. *M.* tells me (p. 14.) *That you asked me whether I included the* Arians, Nestorians, Eutychians *and* Calvinists, *and urged that this Question might be written down; to which I did not consent: Because Mr. T. declared he was fully satisfied, and desired to propose a New Question to Mr.* G.

I grant you did ask me the Question several times, whether I included the *Arians*, *Nestorians*, &c. I told you I rejected the Doctrines of all such as were condemned by the Four General Councils, as the *Arians*, *Nestorians*, and *Eutychians* were; but it was not pertinent to our Purpose to consider, how far any under those Denominations might be Parts of the Catholick Church: For since we had the Consent of all Christian Churches in this Matter, I had no Reason to lessen the Evidence they gave by a Concurrent Testimony. For the Argument was so much stronger, since all Churches, under all Denominations, did agree in it.

But Mr. *M.* still complains, that I would not permit your Sixth Question, *viz. What Churches I look'd on as Members of the Christian Church?* It is strange he should forget for what Reason I rejected it, *viz.* Because it was not pertinent to our Business. For, if the Testimony of all Christian Churches be more considerable than only of some, why should I lessen the strength of the Argument taken from the Universal Consent of all Christian Churches: The other Question must have led us into other Disputes, foreign to our Business; and my Design was to keep close to *the Matter of Certainty*; about which the Conference began.

And now I hope I have given an Answer to the Letter, *desiring Information of the Conference*; which I did forbear in my first Letter to set down at large, foreseeing that either your self or your Friend would offer me farther Occasion, to give a fuller Account of it.

But because the Substance of the whole Conference depended on those two Points,

1. Whether the Universal Consent of all Christian Churches be not a sufficient Ground for our Certainty, as to our Rule of Faith, *viz.* the Scripture?

2. Whether

2. Whether Tradition from Father to Son, be an Infallible Conveyance of Matters of Faith?

To ſhew wherein the main force of the whole Conference lay in few Words, I deſired you to make good theſe Two Things;

1. That we have no Abſolute Certainty as to the Rule of our Faith, *viz.* the Scripture; although we have a larger and firmer Tradition for it, *viz.* The Conſent of all Chriſtian Churches, than you can have for the Points in Difference between us.

2. That the Tradition from Father to Son, is an Infallible Conveyance in Matters of Faith, notwithſtanding the *Greek Church* is charged by you with Error, which adhered to Tradition.

Now upon this, the Author of the Firſt Letter deſires *to be commended to me as a Man who loves to ſpare his own Pains. For 'tis as much as to ſay, do you do all the Work, and I will ſit by, and tell you whether it be well done or no; muſt Mr.* G. *prove that Proteſtants have no Abſolute Certainty?*

I think you are bound to do it, upon Mr. *M.*'s own Account of the Occaſion of the Conference, *viz. That you affirmed that no Proteſtants could ſhew any Ground of Certainty for their Faith.* And upon this the Conference was deſired; and ſince therein I undertake to ſhew what our Ground of Certainty was, you ought to make it evident wherein it fails: And you have not ſo much as offer'd at any thing to diſprove it, but would fairly have run into another Diſpute; and becauſe I would not yield to it, you and Mr. *M.* call me a *Trifler.* You ſee I have not been *ſo ſparing of my Pains* now; but I would commend that Gentleman to you, who get other Men to do your Work for you.

But he goes on, *I thought it had concerned them to be ſatisfied that they have.* Yes, ſo we are; and are very well ſatisfied that we ſtand upon ſurer Grounds, than thoſe who go upon the baffled Pretence of the Infallibility of *Oral Tradition*; for which no one Church of the Chriſtian World hath declared.

For the *Infallibility* of *Tradition* in the Church of *Rome* is another thing, depending upon a Divine Promiſe, and not a kind of mere Natural Infallibility. But he ſaith, *he takes no notice that the Queſtion is veered from Certainty of Proteſtant Doctrine, to Certainty of Scripture.*

How ſtrangely miſtaken is this Gentleman in the whole Matter! For the Queſtion was wholly about the *Certainty of Faith* in general; as fully appears by what is ſaid already. When the Grounds of Faith are made clear, we ſhall come eaſier to particular Points of Difference between us. If we may have ſufficient Certainty without your Pretence of Infallibility, then we may have a true and ſound Faith without coming into your Church; and where there is ſuch a Faith, there is a Poſſibility of Salvation, and conſequently there can be no Neceſſity of Forſaking the Communion of a Church, where we have ſuch certain Grounds of Faith.

Mr. *M.* in anſwer to the firſt Particular, ſpeaks more home and cloſe to the Purpoſe, and therefore what he ſaith deſerves to be more ſtrictly Examined.

(1.) *It is not denied,* ſaith he (p. 28.) *that there is in Faith an abſolute Certainty for that Scripture wherein we agree.* Thus far Mr. *M.* grants what you deny, *That we Proteſtants have abſolute Certainty for our Faith.* But he will not allow us to be able *to ſhew any ſuch Certainty on our Principles.* Now this is truly a hard Caſe we are in; there is an Abſolute Certainty,

Certainty, and this Certainty lies in Universal Tradition; and we can shew this Universal Tradition, and yet we cannot shew the true Ground of our Certainty. If this be our Case, we deserve to be either pitied or begg'd.

But surely Mr. *M.* hath some Colour for such a strange Assertion. This is all he pretends for it; *That in the time of the Reformation, the Protestants charged all Christian Churches with Errors, not only in other Articles of their Belief, but even in the Tradition or Delivery of Scripture.* Therefore we can have no Certainty now, from the Universal Tradition of Christian Churches. Suppose some Men were then to blame, in charging some Churches with more Errors than they were guilty of; must therefore no Argument be taken from their Consent, when things are more cleared, and better understood? This is just as if it had been said of the Blind Man whom our Saviour cured, *You saw Men walking like Trees* at first, and therefore you have no Right to judge them to be otherwise now. Or like one newly escaped out of a dark Prison, who fears and suspects every one he meets, and takes all for Enemies, till he be better acquainted with them; must this Man therefore never have any certain Knowledge afterwards of Friends and Enemies? But why doth not Mr. *M.* name *the Churches which the Reformers charged with Errors in delivering the Canon of Scripture*? I am sure they plead the Consent of the Eastern Churches against the *Tridentine Canon*, as to the Old Testament; and all Christian Churches are known to agree as to the New, and why such an *Universal Consent* should not afford a *Ground of Certainty* to us, is beyond my Understanding.

*(2.)* He saith, *Our Rule is Scripture, not as interpreted (or to be interpreted) by the Church, but as understood (or to be understood, without a necessity of submitting to the Interpretation of the Church) by every sober Enquirer, tho' of the meanest Capacity; for which Rule we are far from having the Consent of all Christian Churches.* The main Question is, Whether Scripture be a *Rule of Faith* to us, or not? And certainly all that believe it to be the *Word of God*, must take it for a *Rule of Faith*. For, since the Reason of our Believing is because God hath revealed, whatever God hath revealed must be believed; and a Book containing in it such Revelations, must be the Rule of our Faith; *i. e.* by it we are to judge what we are bound to believe as Divine Revelations. The best of your Divines do all agree, That our Faith is not to be resolved into any other Revelation than that which was made by Christ and his Apostles, and that this Revelation is contained in the Books of the New Testament. This being agreed on both sides, every Christian, how mean soever his Capacity be, must look on the Scripture as his Rule of Faith; for he that is bound to believe at all, must have some Rule, or else he may believe any thing: He finds all Persons agreed, that the Scripture is the Word of God, and God's Word is an Infallible Rule; therefore he is bound to search the Scripture, for the Matters of Faith. And is it possible to imagine that God himself should direct the making of this Rule for the Benefit of all who are bound to believe, and not to make it useful to its End, *viz.* to be able to direct them in the necessary Points of Salvation? The Founders of Monastic Orders made Rules for all those who were to live in them, and obliged them to observe them, under Pain of Expulsion: I desire to know, whether this doth not suppose that those Rules are capable of being understood by all Persons admitted into those Orders, so far as they are concerned?

And

And whether the Penalty would be reaſonable, in caſe they could not underſtand their Duty by them? But in our caſe the Matter is of far greater Moment; for Mens Eternal Salvation or Miſery depends upon *knowing and doing the will of God* contained in Scripture: And therefore it is of ſo much greater Conſequence and Neceſſity, that all Perſons who are concerned for their Salvation, ſhould be able to underſtand by diligent and careful reading the Scripture, ſo much as is required of them in order to it. And this was the certain Faith of the Primitive Church, *that all things neceſſary to Salvation were plain in Scripture*; and if they were plain, they needed no Interpreter.

*But we have not the Conſent of all Chriſtian Churches, that the Scriptnre is a Rule of Faith without the Churches Interpretation.* I anſwer, that we have the Conſent of all Chriſtian Churches, that the Scripture is a *Rule of Faith*; but, whether beſides this Rule, there be an *Infallible Judge of Controverſies*, or *Interpreter of Scripture*, is another diſtinct Controverſy. We have the unanimous conſent of all Chriſtian Churches for the one; but in the preſent ſtate of *Chriſtendom* we do not pretend it for the other: For we are well enough acquainted with the pretence of *Infallibility in the Church of* Rome; but then we ſay that it is impoſſible for you to bring ſuch an unanimous conſent of all Chriſtian Churches for your *Infallible Judge*, as we do bring for *our Rule of Faith*; and therefore we have much greater certainty of *our Rule*, than you can have of your *Infallible Judge*. We appeal to *all the Churches* of the *Chriſtian World* for our Rule; you dare not appeal to *any one Church* beſides your own for your *Infallibility*: For, it is utterly denied by all the *Eaſtern* Churches, though of very different Denominations. And when you bring an univerſal conſent of all Chriſtian Churches for the *Roman Churches Infallibility*, I may ſafely promiſe to become your Convert.

*But yet they do not agree that every man is to interpret Scripture for himſelf.* What is the meaning of *interpreting Scripture for himſelf*? If it be, that a Man is to rely on Scripture as his Rule of Faith in order to Salvation, then we have their univerſal conſent, in as much as they deliver this as the Rule of Faith. If it be, that in doubtful places he is to rely on his own Judgment, without making uſe of the beſt helps; then we pretend to no ſuch thing; for we aſſert the contrary, and do think in all doubtful Caſes that Perſons are bound to make uſe of the beſt and moſt reaſonable means for their Satisfaction; among which we not only reckon Prayer, Meditation, comparing Scripture and Expoſitors upon it, but the help of Spiritual Guides, and the Senſe of the Primitive Church; which our Church doth eſpecially recommend, and which we look on as the beſt Arbitrator between us in all our Controverſies about the ſenſe of doubtful places of Scripture.

But after all, either there muſt be *an Infallible Judge*, or every Man muſt judge for himſelf in all Matters that concern his Salvation. And therefore, if we have the conſent of all Chriſtian Churches, againſt the only pretended Infallible Judge, we have their conſent likewiſe, that every Man is to judge for his own Salvation. And this all Mankind are really agreed in, whatever ſome may pretend; or elſe it is to no purpoſe for you to go about to make Converts; for, in ſo doing, you make the Perſon you intend to convert Judge of the beſt way to Salvation; and not only ſo, but you make him Judge of all the Controverſies between Us and You, and eſpecially of the *true grounds of Faith.*

And

And how ridiculous after this is it to pretend that a Man is not to judge for himself in matters that concern his Salvation?

(3.) Lastly, Mr. *M.* (p. 29.) *desires to know what those Christian Churches are, whose Testimony is required towards the assuring us, what is Scripture and what not, and by what Mark I distinguished them from others?* I answer again, by no other Mark than that they are *Christian Churches*; and it is a great satisfaction to any Man's Mind, that however they differ about other matters, yet they are all agreed in the Canon of the New Testament. I am by no means bound *to assign any Rule in this case*, as you desire, *whereby to distinguish Orthodox Churches from Heretical*; for, whatever they are in other points, they all agree in this, which is the Foundation of our Faith.

As to the 2d. Point I proposed in my Letter to be made good, *viz. That the Tradition from Father to Son is an infallible Conveyance of Matters of Faith, notwithstanding the Greek Church is charged by you with Errors, which adhered to Tradition*; the Author of the first Letter thinks *you are concerned to answer it.* But then he thinks *I am as well bound to answer your Argument.* In good time! But was not that very Instance of the *Greek Church* produced on purpose to shew the weakness of the Argument? And is not making that plain, answering it as effectually, as the Philosopher's Argument against Motion was, when the Man moved before him? For he proved that impossible, which he shewed was so far from it, that he saw him do it. And Sophistical Arguments are best answer'd by clear and undeniable Instances: And this of the *Greek Church* is of that nature.

But he saith, *Objections may be raised against the most undeniable Truth*; and he instanceth in *two things mathematically demonstrable*; *and yet Objections may be made against them, which cannot easily be answered.* But the difference of the Case is very plain; for those instances only shew, that there are some things above our Comprehension about Matter and Motion; but what is this to an infallible Rule of Faith; which every one is bound to know, if (according to you) he would have any certainty of his Faith? And if it appears by a notorious Instance that it fails, (for a whole Church, and a very great and ancient Church, is accused by you of no less than Heresy, and yet it adhered to Tradition) then the Demonstration is quite gone. But Mr. *M.* saith (p. 29.) *That you never acknowledged that the* Greek *Church erred while it adhered to Tradition*; *and therefore my supposing it is to beg the Question, and mis-represent the state of the Argument.* But whether you acknowledged it or not, the *Greek Church* did adhere to *Tradition*, when the *Latin* Church charged it with Heresy. And certainly I may be allowed to argue from an undeniable instance, as I shall believe it to be, till I see the Answer to it which Mr. *M.* promises in his Conclusion.

Before he comes to that, he lets me know (p. 31.) *that himself and several others, upon comparing my two Propositions together, had found a contradiction in them, and so they had once more Dr.* St. *against Dr.* St. This is as witty an Observation as the Author of *Pax vobis* had made upon me; who, because I had proved from St. *Paul's Words* that *Jupiter* was sometimes taken among the Heathens for *the true God*, from thence wisely infers, *that I am for introducing Paganism, and hardly believe another Life*; but this is so gross and ridiculous a Calumny, that it hardly deserves to be taken notice of. But I pray let me see *this Controversy-juggle*, as Mr. *M.* phrases it; and how Dr. *St.* is set up against

Dr. *St.* Thus it lies: *In my firſt Propoſition, I ſeem to affirm that the Tradition of all Chriſtian Churches is a Ground of Abſolute Certainty for the Admittance of Scripture; and in the ſecond I would infer, that Tradition is no Infallible Conveyance of Matters of Faith, but the Belief of the Scripture is a Matter of Faith.* A rare Diſcovery! Methinks Mr. *G.* appears very well qualified to ſet up for a Controvertiſt, and much ſuch a one as thoſe who formerly ſet Dr. *St. againſt Dr.* St. But the Author of the Firſt Letter obſerves, *that I ſpare my own Pains, and put the Proof upon you*; and Mr. *M.* confeſſes, *that the Occaſion of the Conference was, that you affirmed that Proteſtants could not ſhew any Ground of Abſolute Certainty for their Faith.* Therefore, ſince you own *Tradition* to be an infallible way of conveying Faith, I deſired to know how you could deny that we had any ground for *abſolute certainty* of our Faith as to the Word of God, when the *Tradition* we go upon is ſo *much larger and firmer* than any you can bring for the Points of Faith in difference between us. But then as to your way of explaining Tradition, not with reſpect to the *Books of Scripture*, but to *particular Doctrines of Faith*, I propoſed the ſecond particular to you to make good, *viz.* That the Tradition from Father to Son is an infallible conveyance of Matters of Faith, notwithſtanding the *Greek Church* is charged by you with Error which adhered to Tradition.

If therefore you do own the Infallibility of Tradition you have no Reaſon to deny that we have *any ground of Certainty*, who have a more unqueſtionable Tradition for the Scriptures, than you can have for your diſtinguiſhing Doctrines, or the Matters of Controverſy between us. Yet, how can you eſteem your way of *Tradition* an infallible conveyance of Matters of Faith, when you charge the *Greek Church* with Hereſy, which adhered to Tradition?

Thus I leave any Reader to judge, where the appearance of a Contradiction lies.

There remains nothing more in either of the Letters which I can think requires an Anſwer; unleſs it be that I charge Mr. *M.* with *uſing Arts to get Mr.* T. *to ſign your Copy.* I do confeſs that when he told me Mr. *M.* had ſpoken to him that they might meet and compare and ſign each other's Copies, without acquainting me with it, or deſiring that Copy which was taken for me, (and was read aloud till the Company roſe) and *that he had ſaid I gave out falſe Copies*, I did look upon theſe as *Arts*; but if he doth not like this Name (nor Mr. *T.*) I can ſoon find out another. And the matter of Fact is owned by Mr. *M.* in theſe words: *Meeting accidentally with Mr.* T. *in the Street, I told him I heard you complained that Mr.* G. *'s Papers of the Conference were falſe, and therefore I deſired him to compare his Copy with that which was written for Mr.* G. *that we might ſee whether Mr.* G. *or his Amanuenſis had dealt fairly or not.* Here is the very thing confeſſed which I complained of, *viz.* that, without acquainting me with it, he would have had Mr. *T.* to have compared his Copy with theirs, after he confeſſes I had complained that the Copy they gave out was falſe. And if Mr. *T.* had complied with this Propoſition, and after comparing had ſigned your Copy, what Triumphs had then been made, that Mr. *T.* himſelf had owned your Copy againſt me! And for this matter I need not make *any Inſinuation*, for the thing it ſelf is clear. The only way for your Juſtification had been, when you heard of my Complaint, to have brought or ſent your Copy to me to have examined and compared it; but I ſay ſtill, it

was

was very unjustifiable for you to give out a Copy for the true Account of the Conference, which was never read nor compared; and I think I have now made appear to have been both *false and imperfect.*

And now, having finished the main Parts of my Answer, I must make a Review, that nothing which may be thought material may escape me. For that is the constant Method of some Men, to cry up what is unanswered for unanswerable, altho' it were only passed over as not deserving it.

I did say in my former Letter, that you took great Care in the Conference it self, to keep me from expecting any great Ingenuity after it. The Author of the first Letter *desires Information, what that Care was?* I am very unwilling to expose your Methods of Managing Conferences: But I desire that Gentleman to be present at any of them, and he will find Satisfaction enough. But Mr. *M.* as a Proof of your Fairness, insists (p. 2.) *on your desire to put Things into Writing.* Will Mr. *M.* say, that you carried your self fairly and ingenuously, as to the Manner of the Conference? That you gave me no Interruptions? Used no sleering Behaviour? That you never offer'd to put Things down against my Sense; nor hindered me in setting it down? That you made no Unhandsome Reflections, in the Interlocutory Part? If Charity be any Part of Ingenuity, you shewed it abundantly: For, when you spake of *Churches in Communion with* Rome, Mr. *T.* said, What! and all other Churches must be *in Gehenna?* You replied, with great Charity and Ingenuity, *That many a true Word was spoke in jest.* If you are your self in earnest, I pray let us know for what Reason you damn us all? Is it for want of *Certainty in our Faith?* That is very far from being proved by you. And if you could prove it in your way, for all that I can see, you will damn almost all in the Church of *Rome*, as well as all out of it. For, if this *Oral Tradition* be the *only certain way of Faith*, and all are damn'd who want such *Certainty*; what will become of all those in the Church of *Rome*, who believe as little of the *Infallibity of Oral Tradition* as we do?

But, to return to your Ingenuity in the Conference: I observe, That Mr. *M.* only mentions *this Proposal of putting the Conference in Writing*, to shew your Ingenuity: He saith not a word of it, as to your manner of Managing it. And truly, I then thought he was ashamed of it; but whether he were or not, I am sure he had Cause for it. He confesses there was *Noise, Wrangling, Confusions, Interruptions, Heat, Passion, Personal Reflections*; (p. 3, 9, 15.) And all this while you were very fair and ingenuous, very meek and candid, very soft and obliging; not in the least boisterous, impertinent, or provoking. Which all, who have been present at your Conferences, will set their Hands to. Alas, Sir! How much are you wronged, by being charged with Disingenuity in the Conference? You are only forced sometimes to overcome your *Natural Repugnance to it*, as Mr. *M.* saith he was, *in writing his Letter to me.*

There is one thing Mr. *M.* frequently insists upon, which I must give an Answer to; *viz.* That I was glad to put an end to the first Dispute; *That the Issue of it was such, that you could have*

*no Temptation for Forgery in the Account of it, which is not greatly for my Credit*; (p. 9.) *That I was beholden to Mr.* T. *for breaking it off*; (p. 20.) *That I was as little pleased with the true Copies, as with the false ones*; (p. 23.) *That the Conference it self was as little to my Satisfaction, as the worst Account of it*; (p. 25.) These are very fine Insinuations, I must not say *Artificial*; for Mr. *M.* will no more like a Word taken from *Arts*, than the Word it self. If he means, that I was very little pleased with the manner of your Conference, I do freely confess it; and none who have been present at your other Conferences, will blame me for it.

But if he thinks that I was unsatisfied with the *Grounds* of *Certainty* which I gave, I utterly deny it. For I still assert the same thing, and abide by the Answer I then gave; and do still hold, That the *Universal Testimony of all Christian Churches, is a sufficient Ground of Absolute Certainty to us, as to the Rule of Faith.* And this is an Answer I am so fully satisfied in, that neither then nor now do I fear any Objections against it. But I would not be drawn off from the main Point to another Debate: And because I resolved to stick there, I thought it most reasonable that Mr. *T.* should be yielded to, for breaking it off at the Point in Question; which was not about the *True Parts of the Catholick Church*, but about the *True Ground of Certainty we had for our Faith.*

And when Mr. *T.* declared, he had full Satisfaction as to that; what Reason had I to go any further?

As to the Truest Copies of the Conference, I was not forward to disperse them; not out of any Mistrust of the Answers I gave, but because they contained only short Heads, and General Answers: For those who desire to see an Account of a Conference, expect to see a Relation of all that passed, or at least of all material Passages relating to it; and therefore, only a General Representation of it would seem dry and jejune, and not answer the Expectation they had of the Relation of a Conference. But, as to the Matter it self, so far as it is truly set down, (of which I have now given a fuller Account) I do abide by it. And, *if my Credit suffer by it*, I do assure you, it is not by reason of any Objection Mr. *M.* hath made against it, or any that I foresee can be made.

Mr. *M.* chargeth me with *Disingenuous and Unchristian Proceeding* toward you; (p. 23.) This is a home Charge, and *not much indeed for my Credit*, if he can in the least make it good. But if not, I leave him to judge where the *Disingenuous and Unchristian Proceeding* lies; and to remember his Application of *the Mote and the* B E A M, (p. 15.) Whereon is the heavy Charge grounded? Why, forsooth, *When I heard of false and imperfect Copies, I ought to have sent to you, to know whether they were given out by you*? What! When they came to my Hands from those very Persons to whom you gave them? *But, I ought to have shewn you the Errors of them, and desired their Amendment.* It was, indeed, a very likely and hopeful way of Vindicating my self. When I knew, from the very Persons to whom you spake, what Boasts you had made of your Victory, and what

Pub-

Publick Places you had read the Copies in; it was a very probable thing, that if I had shewed you the Falsity of them, you would have gone to those very Places and Persons, and told them; 'Gentlemen, I must beg all your Pardons, for I 'communicated false Copies to you, and told you idle and ly-'ing Stories about the Conference: For I have been since with 'Dr. *St.* and he hath demonstrated to me, that my Copy was 'not true; altho' it were my own Copy, and that which I 'deliver'd to you for very true'. Do you think, Sir, you could have overcome your *Natural Repugnance* so much, as to have yielded to this Method of Satisfaction? If not, when I was assured so many Copies were dispersed in Town and Country, which you could not recal, if you intended it; when I was called upon time after time by my Friends, and it was told me, something must be done towards my Vindication: What could I do more proper or effectual, than to publish that Letter; which hath so much provoked Mr. *M.* as to make him overcome his *Natural Repugnance*, and to appear in Print?

*But yet there are other Circumstances which make my Proceeding neither Ingenuous nor Christian.* As that, *The Letter was published so long after.* That shews how unwilling I was to be brought to it; and nothing but mere Necessity could have overcome my *Natural Repugnance*, in such a Case. For, as the Author of the former Letter well observes, *I love to spare my own Pains. But I took the Opportunity of your Absence.* Therein Mr. *M.* did me Injury. For, truly Sir, it was perfectly the same thing to me, whether you were at *London* or *West-Chester*. Nay, the Argument would hold the other way, if it were true. For I heard of your talking of going to *Chester*, soon after the Conference; and that you told Persons you were *just going*; and I did believe you to be there, till I heard of some other Conferences of yours. I do not think my self bound to enquire after your Stays or Removes; but I know how you had done me wrong, and therefore Mr. *M.* can have no Reason to blame me for doing what was necessary for my own Vindication.

Mr. *M.* charges me, (p. 35.) *with having too mean an Opinion of you.* If I be to blame in this, I hope you will take Care to rectifie it: But Mr. *M.* hath not done much towards it. However, he takes a notable Advantage, as he thinks, from hence: *We*, saith he, *will be contented to pass for Weak and Ignorant; and I shall be obliged to shew by whom you may be protected from Error.* A very well compounded Business! But what if it be not in my Power, or any ones else, to make you Infallible? Did I ever promise or undertake any such thing? Or set up Infallible Bills? When I do so, then come to me for such Directions. We never pretend to make any Persons Infallibles but to put them into a certain way to be saved; which we think is much better. And if Men be honest and sincere in their Endeavours, to know and do the Will of God, we have the Word of God for it, that they are in the certain way to Salvation; but if they could be kept from all Error and yet not be sincerely Good, *Can Faith save him?* Jam. 2. 14. *What doth it profit, my Brethren, though a man say he hath Faith* (even infallible Faith) *and have not Works?* I have long wonder'd at this kind of *Missionary Zeal*,

as

as Mr. *M.* ſpeaks, (*p.* 34.) *againſt Error, and the want of I know not what Infallibility*; when ſo much leſs Zeal is ſhewed againſt Men's Paſſions and Vices: Whereas, the Virtues of the Mind, and of a good Life, are far more excellent and uſeful to Mankind, than being kept from Involuntary Errors. But, ſaith Mr. *M. It is a moſt uncomfortable thing, to be ſhewn that you ought not to truſt your Reaſon, and to be told you ought.* In anſwer to this Suggeſtion, I will tell you a very comfortable thing; and that is, the Allowance God makes for Ignorance and Weakneſs. For, if God will not charge Involuntary Errors upon us, we may think our ſelves as ſafe as if we were infallible. What Reaſon we have, we ought to make uſe of for the beſt Purpoſes; but if our Reaſon fail us, the Goodneſs of God will not, if we be Sincere.

Yet Mr. *M.* cannot get it out of his head, but, *that it is my Task to give ſome diſtinguiſhing Mark for the finding out thoſe Chriſtians on whoſe Tradition we may ſafely rely for the Reception of the holy Scriptures.* How often muſt I repeat it, that it is none of my Task? And that, if the Teſtimony of all Chriſtian Churches be a ſufficient Ground of Certainty, I have no Reaſon to examine farther? As for Inſtance, ſuppoſe upon a *Lord-Mayor's* Day, I ask of all the ſeveral Liveries and Companies, and other People, whether *my Lord-Mayor* be gone by; and they all unanimouſly agree, that he is; have not I reaſon to be ſatisfied by this *univerſal Conſent*? Ay, but, Sir, ſaith Mr. *M.* you are to conſider, that there was a great Diverſity in the Companies you met with; there was my *Lord-Mayor's* own Company, and many beſides, ſome whereof had no Charters confirmed to them, I deſire you to tell me, which of the Companies had Charters, and which not; for my part, I will believe none but the Teſtimony of thoſe Companies which could produce their Charters. But, ſay I, if our Diſpute was about *legal Companies*, you ſay very well; but ſince I aim at no more than knowing, whether *my Lord-Mayor* be gone by or not; I think the Teſtimony of them all is ſufficient, whether incorporated or not; whether they were of the *Orange* or *Blue Regiment*, or any other People in the Street; when I find them all to agree in the ſame thing, I have no reaſon to queſtion the Certainty of it. I will not think ſo *poorly of your Underſtandings*, as to think it needs Application. But I muſt think ſo, if yet you think it my Task *to find out a diſtinguiſhing Mark between Churches*, when the Univerſal Teſtimony of all Chriſtian Churches is ſufficient for the Certainty of our Faith; which Mr. *M.* ſo often grants was the Occaſion and Subject of the Conference.

And now there is nothing remaining to be anſwered in Mr. *M's* Letter to me, but his learned Diſcourſes about *Verbal Conferences* and *Coffee-Houſes*; which will require no long Anſwer from me.

As to *Verbal Conferences*, they depend ſo much on the Temper, Ingenuity, Preſence of Mind, and particular Skill in Controverſy which Perſons have, that no certain Rule can be given about them. They may do Good, or Hurt, be Uſeful or Miſchievous, as the Perſons and Circumſtances are. And it is not the ſetting down ſome general Heads can prevent the Miſchief of falſe Reports, as I have had too large and freſh Experience of it. Which ought to make every one more Careful what ſort of Perſons he meets with upon ſuch Occaſions. I do not ſee, how any Man can be ſecure as to his Reputation after them, if they are ſuch as run into Companies, frequent *Coffee-houſes*, and are

apt

apt to boast and to talk much of themselves; as that "at such a time, "saith one, I disputed with such a Man, and these were my Argu- "ments, and he gave such trifling Answers to them, that I wonder he "should have any Reputation. And to convince you, look ye Gentle- "men, here are the Notes of such a Conference, do you mark what a "pitiful Answer this is; and then, when he was required to go farther "he refused, and pretended Business and Want of Time; so that upon "the whole Matter, I conclude him to be a *Mere Trifler*". All this while the Person concerned is at a Distance, and knows nothing of all this; but he is abused, and reproached at the Mercy of such Persons who look on an officious Lie as a Venial Sin; especially when it is thought to serve a Good Cause. And when the injured Person comes to understand how he hath been used, he hath no way left but to publish a Vindication of himself; and so *Verbal Conferences*, must end in writing Controversies; unless some effectual way could be found out to prevent Men's partial and disingenuous Representing them afterwards. There is too great Reason to believe that those who are most Impertinent in a Dispute will be so after it; and great Talkers are commonly great Boasters; especially when they hope to recommend themselves by their pretended Victories and their *Missionary Zeal of disputing in Coffee-houses.*

A thing which Mr. *M.* observes (*p.* 34.) *the Children of the Reformation are little acquainted with.*

And I do not like the Mother of these Children a jot the less for it. For Religion is a grave and serious Thing, and ought to be treated with a Respect due to the Concernments of it. I am far from being a Friend to any *Seditious, idle, or prophane Discourses in those places*; but yet methinks it looks very oddly to turn Places of Diversion into Schools of Disputing. And if such a *Missionary Zeal* prevails, I suppose the Keepers of those Houses will give little Thanks to the Promoters of it; for Men do not love to drink their warm Liquor in Mood and Figure; nor to *lace* their *Coffee* with Controversies.

Mr. *M.* represents me (*p.* 33.) *as one that thought it a Crime to go to Coffee-houses.* Which is a notable device to make all the Gentlemen who frequent them, my Enemies. Whereas I only mentioned your reading your Paper in *Coffee-houses*, and there boasting of your Conference, wherein he might be sure I would not be present to contradict him. But this is a distinguishing *Mark* of Mr. *M*'s Ingenuity.

I shall mention one more, and conclude this Letter. Mr. *M.* confesses *many Lies are told in Coffee-houses*, (p. 33.) and I have some Reason to believe him.

*But if*, saith he, *all Places are to be avoided, wherein Lies are told, I am afraid Dr. St. would run the hazard of being silenced for want of a Pulpit which might be ventured on.* This is such an obliging Complement to the *London Clergy* to compare their *Pulpits* to *Coffee-houses* for *Lying*, that it is beyond my skill to return it. But if there be so little Truth in our Pulpits, as Mr. *M.* suggests, (which I am sure he can never prove) yet the constant Loyalty which hath been preached there, might have made Mr. *M.* a little more civil to them, than to compare them to *Coffee-houses*; wherein himself complains of *Seditious, idle, and prophane Discourses.*

*I am,*

*SIR,*

*London*, Apr. 21. 1687.

*Your Humble Servant,* E. S.

# A DISCOURSE Concerning the Nature and Grounds OF THE CERTAINTY OF FAITH, &c.

WHEN I publiſhed my two Letters to Mr. *Godden*, I had *good Reaſon* to expect an Anſwer from him, who began the Controverſy. But it ſeems he had *better Reaſon* to forbear, (and it is not hard to gueſs at it) and I am turned over to one who pretends to write *Catholick Letters* againſt me. I have a great and juſt Reverence for ſome *Catholick Epiſtles*, and believe them written by an *Infallible Spirit*; but for theſe *Catholick Letters*, though their whole Deſign be *Infallibility*, yet I cannot find ſo much as a fair *Probability* in them. But why muſt theſe be call'd *Catholick Letters?* Are they written by ſome *Catholick Biſhop*, to give an Account of his Faith, according to the Cuſtom of the antient Church? Is it that the Doctrine contained in them is undoubtedly *Catholick?* So far from it, that I ſhall make it appear, that no one Church of the *Chriſtian World* ever own'd it. But, ſuppoſe it had been the Doctrine of the *Roman Church*, how could this make them *Catholick Letters*, unleſs ſo great a *Logician* had firſt proved, that a part may aſſume the Denomination of the whole? But then why not *Roman Catholick Letters*, according to the new Style? There was a Reaſon for this. *J. Sergeant* hath not forgotten how hardly he had lately eſcap'd Cenſure at *Rome*, for the Principles contained in them; and therefore though he hopes they may paſs for *Catholick* here, yet he durſt not join *Roman* to *Catholick* in the Title of his Letters.

But how comes *J. Sergeant* to be concern'd in this Controverſy with Mr. *Godden?* The Account he gives of it in the Beginning of his *Firſt Letter* is very pleaſant. He ſaith, *He accepted a Commiſſion from Mr.* Godden, *to hold his Cards, while he is not in Circumſtances to play out his Game himſelf.* I

will not examine Mr. *Godden*'s *Circumstances*, nor *the Game he plays at*; but methinks this is no very decent way of expressing the undertaking a Debate about *Matters of Faith and Salvation*. But in truth, he makes the Business of *Infallibility*, as he handles it, to be a Matter of *Sport* and *Diversion*, notwithstanding all his *Grimaces* and *Tragical Expressions* about it. It is hard to be severe upon a Metaphor; but suppose it be allowed, yet I wonder of all Men he should pitch upon *J. Sergeant to hold his Cards for him*, who had play'd his own so ill, and so much to the Dissatisfaction of the leading Men of his own Church. Yet he now appears as brisk and confident as if he were some *New Gamester*, although he produces his *old sullied Cards* (a little wiped) over again, and seems to have forgotten the Answer to his *sure Footing*, and the Account he still owes to the World for it. I know not how far it agrees with the Laws of *Ecclesiastical Chivalry*, for one, who hath not defended himself, to appear a Champion for another, especially in the same Cause; but there is no great Reason to apprehend he should do much for another, who hath done next to nothing for himself.

The main Subject of the Debate is, about the *Nature* and *Grounds* of the *Certainty of Faith*; and the Method I think most natural and effectual to proceed in, is,

I. To shew how unfit *J. Sergeant* of all Men is to undertake this Cause.

II. To settle the true State of the Controversy between us.

III. To examine the Reasons he produces against our Grounds of Certainty.

IV. To lay open the Weakness of his Arguments, on behalf of the Infallibility of *Oral* and *Practical* Tradition.

I. As to *J. Sergeant* his appearing in this Cause again, we are to consider that in his *Catholick Letters*, he frequently owns *Faith vindicated*, *Reason against Raillery*, and *Error nonpluss'd*, and even *sure Footing* it self. But I shall now shew, that he disowned the main Principles in those Books, when he was in great Danger of being censured at *Rome* for them, and therefore is not to be allow'd to produce them again. The Account of this Matter will give great Light into the State of the present *Controversy*, and is therefore necessary to be premised to it.

Out of those Books of *J. Sergeant* a considerable Person in the Church of *Rome* selected three *Propositions* about the *Grounds* of his *Infallible Certainty*, which were these;

Faith vindicated, *p.*13. I. *That he who is obliged to profess Faith-Propositions true, must see the Connection between their Terms, and consequently that they cannot be unconnected or false.*

Faith vindicated, *p.*41. II. *If the two Terms be not seen to be connected, these Propositions may, nay ought to be deny'd by the Respondent, whose Office and Right it is to grant nothing but what is evident, lest he ensnare himself.*

Error nonpluss'd, *p.*135 III. *'Tis requisite and necessary, that the Assent of Faith in divers particular Believers be formally Infallible; or that those Persons be infallibly certain, by evident Reasons, that the Authority or Rule of Faith they rely on cannot herein deceive them. Else great Wits and acute Reflectors, whose piercing*

*Piercing Understandings require convictive Grounds for their Faith, would remain for ever unsatisfied: nor would the wisest Christians sincerely and heartily assent to, nor with honesty profess the Truth of their Faith, nor could any prove it true, or establish rational doubters in it, or convert Men of exact knowledge to it, or convince Hereticks, calling the Truth of it in question. Nor could Governors and leading Persons with any Conscience or Credit propose and preach the Truth of Faith to the Generality.*

These Propositions were tender'd to two Doctors of the *Sorbon*, who declared, *The First could not be explained in a Catholick Sense*; and therefore very unfit for *Catholick Letters*. *For if* (say they) *a Person sees the Connexion between the Terms, it would be Science, and not Faith; it is enough to see them not to be contradictory, or that the Connexion is not repugnant to Reason. Divine Faith is above, not contrary to Reason.* *Hæres. Blakloan.* P. 37, 38.

As to the Second, they agreed, *That neither could that be explained in a Catholick Sense, because it is destructive of Faith, and a Proposition ought not, cannot be denied, although the Respondent hath not Evidence of the Terms of which it consists; when he otherwise knows the Church (which Faith* [not Demonstration] *teaches to be Infallible in Matters of Faith) to propose as a Truth revealed by God.*

To the Third, they say, *That it cannot be explained in a Catholick Sense: Because it is sufficient that the Church be believed by Faith to be Infallible, and it is not requisite that the Infallibility of the Church be proved by evident Reason.*

See here the main Design of his *Catholick Letters* declared to be no *Catholick Doctrine*; which is to prove that there must be Infallible Certainty by Conclusive Evidence of the Churches Infallibility. And if this be not *Catholick Doctrine*, I am infallibly certain his Letters are far from being *Catholick* in their Sense.

One of these Doctors writes to the A. B. of *D.* That *the Natural Sense of the Propositions could not be Catholick; and that all Bishops were bound to suppress this Doctrine, lest it did mischief to the Flock of Christ. And that the A. B. of* Paris *would revoke his Licence, if the Author did not retract them, as he hoped he would.* P. 39. What? Retract the Substance of his *Catholick Letters!* Is this possible? And yet again publish the same Doctrine as *Catholick!* This is indeed very *surprising*. But so it was. For the A. B. of *D.* averrs, *That* J. Serjeant *confessed the Propositions to be Heretical, yea very Heretical*; but he said, *they were not taken in his sense*; P. 39. which the other said, *was a ridiculous Plea.* He granted, that *J. S.* might *contradict himself*, but there was no colour for saying *the Propositions, were not taken in their true sense.* P. 40. And Mr. *S.* being requir'd by the A. B. of *Paris* to *Anathematize these Propositions, and to subscribe to the Censure that they could not be explained in a Catholick Sense; he did it.* P. 42. And yet the sense of them is maintained by him in his *Catholick Letters.* P. 44. Is not such a Man *fit to hold the Cards for Mr.* G.? Who makes the same Doctrine to be *Heretical* and *Catholick*, as his Circumstances require. And in his own Language, *he goes backwards and forwards, blows and sups, declares for and against* the same Principles. *Third Letter*, p. 65.

This Doctrine of *J. Serjeant* was complained of at *Rome*, and a *Congregation of Cardinals* was appointed to Examine it, and they sent their Instructions about it to the *Pope's Nuncio* at *Paris*, where *J. Serjeant* then was. And therein they took notice, that in his *Vindication* sent to them, *he detested that Doctrine as Heretical*, viz. *that the Evidence of the Connexion of Predicate and Subject, and the Evidence of the Rule of Faith by which the* *Append. ad Hæres. Blakloan.*

*Believer may be infallibly certain he cannot be deceived, is neceſſary in order to Faith.* I deſire the Reader to mark this *Declaration* which *J. Serjeant* ſent to *Rome*, and to compare it with the Doctrine of his *Catholick Letters*: But of that hereafter.

But it is worth our while to ſhew with what a *double Face J. Serjeant* appeared in his *Vindication* and *Complaint*, ſent to *Rome*, and in his *Books* which he publiſhed here. And by that, the Reader may judge of the *Catholick* Sincerity of the Writer of theſe Letters.

## I. About the *Faith* he deſigns to demonſtrate.

Faith Vindicated, *Preface.*

*I declare then, that my chief End in this Treatiſe, is to ſettle Chriſtian Faith, or to demonſtrate, that it muſt be truly or abſolutely certain, and that my applying it now and then to my Oppoſers, is only a Secondary Intention, and meerly Occaſional.*

Querimonia *adverſ.* Lominum. *p* 49.

He ſaith, *He ſpeaks not of Faith in itſelf, but as it is controverted among us.*

*The ſame he affirms* p. 145, 146. *that he meddles not with Faith, but with reſpect to his Adverſaries; or as it is diſputed between* Catholicks *and thoſe he calls* Hereticks, *p.* 148.

If it were his deſign *to ſettle Chriſtian Faith, and to make it truly and abſolutely certain, and only ſecondarily applying it to his Oppoſers; how is it poſſible* that at the ſame time, *he ſhould not meddle with Faith in itſelf, but meerly with reſpect to his Oppoſers?* Is not this a brave Undertaker, to make *Faith infallibly certain*, who ſo evidently contradicts himſelf as to his own deſign? But it ſeems, *to us* he muſt pretend to make Faith certain in itſelf; but *at Rome*, he meant no more by it, but only to perplex and confound us. As though his Demonſtrations were only intended for a ſort of *Metaphyſical Traps* to catch Hereticks with. But we are glad to ſee by his own Confeſſion, that Faith in itſelf is not made *abſolutely Certain* by them.

## II. About the *Objects* of *Faith*, and the *Evidence* of them.

Reaſon againſt Raillery, *pag.* 55.

*The ſtrongeſt and wiſeſt Souls are unapt to aſſent but upon Evidence: Hence, unleſs ſuch Men ſee Proofs abſolutely concluding thoſe Points true, they are unapt to be drawn to yield to them, and embrace them as certain Truths—— Nothing can rationally ſubdue the Faculty of ſuſpending, in ſuch Men at leaſt, but True Evidence had from the Object working this clear ſight in them, either by itſelf, or by Effects or Cauſes neceſſarily connected with it. Other Evidences I know none.*

Faith Vindicated, *p.* 12, 13.

*The Truth of Propoſitions of Faith conſiſts in the Connexion of thoſe*

In his Declaration ſent to *Rome*, p. 11, 13. he not only expreſſed his Aſſent to theſe Propoſitions, but *That the contrary to them were Falſe, Deſtructive of Faith, and Heretical*, viz.

I. *That the Objects of Faith are not to be evident or demonſtrable by Natural Reaſons in order to believing them.*

II. *That in order to the believing ſuch Objects of Faith, conveyed down to us, either by Scripture or Tradition, it is not neceſſary*

*Notions which make the Subject and Predicate. Whoever therefore sees not the Connexion between those Notions in the Principle of Faith, sees not the Truth of any of those Propositions--- It follows, that he who is obliged to profess Faith-Propositions true, must see the Connexion between those Terms.*

*cessary to know evidently the Connexion of Predicate and Subject, but it is sufficient if they be proposed by the Catholick Church.*

Now let any Man try how he can reconcile these things; (1) *Nothing can subdue rationally the Faculty of suspending but true Evidence had from the Object*; and yet *it is destructive to Faith, and Heretical to say, that the Objects of Faith are demonstrable by natural Reason, in order to believing them.* Is not *true Evidence from the Object a natural Reason in order to believing?* (2) *He that sees not the Connexion between Predicate and Subject, sees not the Truth of Faith-propositions; and he who is obliged to profess them, must see it*; and yet, *in order to believing Objects of Faith, it is not necessary to see it, nay it is Heretical to assert it.*

## III. About Infallible Assent.

Reason against Raillery, *p.* 113.

*'Tis most evident therefore and demonstrable, that there is no Certainty, but where there is Infallibility; and that we can never be said to be truly certain of any thing, till, all Circumstances consider'd, we see ourselves out of Possibility of being deceived* hic & nunc *in that very thing.*

In his Declaration, *p.* 11, 13. he owns this Proposition to be *True*, and the contrary to be *Heretical*, viz.

*That it is not necessary, in order to believing the Objects of Faith, that he that believes, should know evidently his Assent to be Supernatural and Infallible.*

But *if there can be no Certainty of Faith, till we see ourselves out of possibility of being deceived*, I should think it very hard to say it was *Heretical to assert it was necessary for him that believes to know his Assent to be Infallible.* For what difference is there between *knowing we cannot be deceived in our Assent*, and that *it is Infallible*? But here he will hope to escape, by joining *Supernatural* to *Infallible*; and so he over-reached the Cardinals by putting those together; for his is nothing but a *pure Natural Infallibility.*

## IV. About the *Mediums* of Faith used by him.

Sure footing, *p.* 172.

He rejects *Extrinsecal Mediums as insufficient, and requires Intrinsecal.*

Faith Vindicated, *Preface, at the end.*

He owns his *Discourses to be built on Intrinsecal Mediums.*

Error Nonpluss'd, *p.* 169.

He requires *clear Evidence from the Object, to ground a firm Assent.*

In his *Subscription* to the *Instructions* from *Rome*, p. 12. he denies that he spake of *Intrinsecal Requisites to Faith; but only of Extrinsecal.* And this he goes about to prove against his own plain Words, in his *Declaration*, Sect. 3. pag. 34, &c.

Pag. 170, 171.

He makes it neceſſary to *true Certainty, that it be taken from the Thing or Object. And true Certainty* (he ſaith) *is built on the Thing's being as it is, and nothing can ever be truly known to be otherwiſe than it is.*

How *can Intrinſecal Mediums*, and *Evidence from the Object*, be only *Extrinſecal Pre-requiſites?*

## V. About *Humane* and *Divine Faith.*

Faith Vindicated, *p.* 73.

*Divine Faith ought to have a far greater degree of Firmneſs in it, than any Humane Faith whatſoever: Wherefore ſince Humane Faith can riſe to that degree of ſtability —— Divine Faith being Supernatural, ought to be more firmly grounded; and conſequently more highly impoſſible to be falſe.*

Errour Nonpluſs'd, *p.* 143.

He ſpeaks expreſly of *Divine Faith.*

In his Vindication, *p.* 97. He ſaith, *It is Evident that he ſpake of Faith, formally as Humane, and not as formally Divine.*

What *Evidence* can there be like a Man's plain Words? Is not that *Divine Faith* which he goes about to demonſtrate the *Infallible Certainty* of? It ſeems we are all this while to ſeek for the Certainty of Faith *formally Divine*; and all this mighty Noiſe about the Neceſſity of *Infallibility*, reaches no farther than a *Faith formally Humane*. And yet *J. Serjeant* affirms that he undertook to prove *the impoſſibility of Falſhood in Divine and Supernatural Faith.* And ſo it ſeems *Divine and Supernatural Faith* muſt derive its *Infallible Certainty* from a meer *Natural Infallibility.* Or if it be but Humane Faith he means, then he falls ſhort of what he promiſed, which was to ſhew the *Infallible Certainty* of *Divine Faith.* And thus the *Trap-maker* is catched himſelf.

## VI. About *particular Points of Faith.*

Errour Nonpluſs'd, *p.* 161.

*I thought he had meant Certainty of the Points of his Faith. What we are then in Reaſon to expect from Dr.* St. *is, that he would bring us Grounds for the Certainty of his Faith, as to determinate Points*, viz. *Chriſt's Godhead, a Trinity*, &c.

Reaſon *againſt* Raillery, *p.* 167.

*Seeing then Chriſtians are bound to profeſs their Faith true, as to thoſe*

*Declaration*, p. 50.

He peremptorily aſſerts (and challenges his Adverſaries to ſhew the contrary *that he produced not one Argument to prove any Points of Doctrine to be Divine, or Supernatural; but only, that ſuch a Doctrine was delivered by Chriſt or his Apoſtles.*

And

*Points of a Trinity, for Example, or Incarnation, &c. it follows, that it must be affirm'd and held that a Trinity or Incarnation absolutely is, and consequently that it is impossible not to be.*

And this he frequently insists upon, and is the main of his Defence.

But why then doth he urge us to produce our Grounds of *Certainty* as to *particular Points*, if himself doth not? If he pretends no more than to prove them in general, why may not we be allowed to do the same? He that calls upon others to do it, in such an insulting manner, is presumed to do it himself; and if he doth not, he only *banters* and abuses his Reader. And after all this mighty Pretence to *Demonstration and Infallibility*, the whole Dispute comes to this, Whether Men may attain to greater Certainty of *Christ's Doctrine* by *Oral and Practical* Traditions, than we can do by *Scripture*, *Reason*, and *Tradition*? But this is against his Words, where he saith, *Seeing then Christians are bound to profess their Faith true, as to those Points of a Trinity, for Example, or Incarnation, &c. it follows, that it must be affirm'd and held that a Trinity or Incarnation absolutely is, and consequently, that it is impossible not to be.*

## VII. About *Moral Certainty.*

His whole Book called *Faith vindicated*, was written against it. And in the Preface to it, *p.* 3. he opposes *absolute Certainty* to *moral*; and he saith, *those who have it not, have no true Faith.*

Page 17.

*True Faith by reason of its immoveable Grounds, can bear an asserting the absolute Impossibility of its Falsehood. And without this, he makes Faith absurd, preternatural, and irrational.*

Page 34.

*Moral Certainty is in reality Uncertainty; and the highest Degree of moral Certainty is the lowest Degree of Uncertainty, truly so called.*

The same he asserts, *pag.* 36, 86, 93.

Error nonpluss'd, *pag.* 195.

*Fallible Certainty destroys all Efficacy, all Defence, and even Essence of Faith.*

When I read in *Lominus*, pag. 43. that *J. Sergeant* in his *Vindication* pleaded, that he required no more than *Moral Evidence for the Assent and Profession of Faith*, I could hardly believe him; and therefore I was earnest to see what he would say in *Answer* to this; but even there, *pag.* 23. he owns it, and saith expressly, *That Moral Evidence is absolutely sufficient to Faith*: But withal he saith, *There is more than Moral Evidence in Tradition.*

Let now any indifferent Person compare those Assertions together: If *Moral Certainty be Uncertainty, and destroy the Essence of Faith*, how can it *be absolutely sufficient to Faith?* But besides *the Contradiction*, he hath by this one Assertion overthrown the whole Design of his

*Catholick*

*Catholick Letters.* For, if *true Faith* may be had without *Infallible Certainty*, what need any ſuch contending about it? For the Ground of the Diſpute is about ſuch *Faith* as is *neceſſary to Salvation*; and if *true Faith*, as *J. Sergeant* grants, which is neceſſary to Salvation, may be had without their pretended Infallibility, there is no Colour left for preſſing Perſons of our Communion to forſake our Church, becauſe we cannot have *Infallible Certainty of Faith*, when themſelves grant that we may be ſaved without it. And what *Sincerity* is to be expected from ſuch a Man, who makes ſuch Outcries upon us, for want of *Infallible Certainty* for Faith, when himſelf confeſſes, that *moral Certainty is ſufficient to Faith?* Whatever becomes of *moral Certainty*, I love *moral Honeſty*; and I cannot ſee how it is conſiſtent with it, to make ſuch mighty Pretences to the Neceſſity of *Infallible Certainty* for Faith, even in his *Catholick Letters*, (which ſeems to be the chief Deſign of them) when himſelf had declared to the Cardinals at *Rome*, that leſs than that is ſufficient for true Faith. But the Secret of it is, he knows well enough there is no ſuch Neceſſity for *Infallible Certainty*; and when it will bring him off, he can own it, but among us *Hereticks* they muſt *bluſter* and make a mighty Noiſe about it, becauſe it ſtartles weak and injudicious People, and they find nothing ſo apt to terrify and confound them like *Infallibility*, which, like a *Flaſh of Lightning*, doth not help them to ſee better, but ſtrikes them down with Horror and Aſtoniſhment.

And here I might fairly ſtop and ſend the Reader to *J. Sergeant* for an effectual Anſwer to his own *Letters*; or at leaſt to ſhew, how very unfit he was after ſuch going forward and backwards in this matter, to undertake this Cauſe.

2. But leſt I ſhould ſeem to decline any thing which may ſeem material, I ſhall now proceed to *ſtate* the *Controverſy*, as it lies between Mr. *Sergeant* and me. For what concerns another Perſon, I ſhall leave it to himſelf, as not ſtanding in need of any Aſſiſtance from me.

The *Occaſion* of the Conference was ſet down by Mr. *M.* to have been, *That Mr.* Godden *affirmed in ſome Companies, that no Proteſtant could ſhew any Ground of Abſolute Certainty for their Faith; and that Mr.* Sergeant *had promiſed him, that if I were not able to manifeſt the contrary, he would forſake our Communion.*

So that Mr. *Godden* was the *Aggreſſor* by laying this Charge upon us, *That we could ſhew no Ground of Abſolute Certainty for our Faith.* And therefore when in the Conference I aſſigned the Scripture for the Ground and Rule of our Faith, and univerſal Tradition for the Proof of the Books of Scripture, I had Reaſon in my Expoſtulatory Letter to Mr. *Godden*, to deſire of him to ſhew, "That we have no abſo-"lute Certainty of the Rule of our Faith, *viz.* the Scripture, altho "we have a larger and firmer Tradition for it, than you can have "for the Points in Difference between us.

This plainly relates to the *Conference, wherein Scripture was own'd to be our Rule, and Univerſal Tradition, the Evidence on which we receive the Books.* And to any Man of Senſe, this is not *ſhifting and tricking off the Proof to Mr.* Godden, as Mr. *Sergeant* often calls it; but it is a plain and evident Proof of our *Certainty* upon their own Grounds. For if *Tradition* be ſuch a Ground of *Abſolute Certainty*, as they aſſerr, and we have *a larger and firmer Tradition for Scripture, than they can produce*

*Firſt Letter, pag. 4, 5, 6.*

*produce for the Points of Faith in Difference between us*; then it is evident we must have, upon their own Principles, a *Ground* of *Absolute Certainty* for our *Faith*, which was the main Point of the Conference.

If he will answer the Argument, he must either deny *that we have Universal Tradition for the Books of Scripture*, or that *Universal Tradition* is a *Ground* for the *Absolute Certainty* of *Faith*: Either of these ways he had said something to the Purpose; but he found this way of Reasoning too hot for him, and therefore he calls it *Shifting and Tricking off the Proof to Mr.* Godden, and so falls into a *tragical Declamation* against *my not proving, and making a Secret of the Ground of our Certainty*; as if a Man intended to make a *Secret* of a Horse he had lost, when he published his *Marks* in the *Gazette*. Here is the *Ground* of our *Certainty*, laid down in that very Place, where he saith, *I shift off the Proof to Mr.* Godden; but alas for him! he cannot see any thing like a *Proof*, unless it be serv'd up with all its due Formalities of *Major*, *Minor* and *Conclusion*. Must I be forced to tell him, as the Painters did by ill Pictures, *This is a Horse, and this a Wolf?* This is an *Argument*, and this an *Answer*? It is a hard Case if a Man cannot understand Reason, unless like *Scaliger*'s Jests against *Cardan*, there be something in the Margin to direct where they are to be found. All Men of Sense understand the Force of an *Argument*, though it be not dressed up after the way of the *Schools*; and to tye Men up to those Methods of Reasoning in our Age in Books of Controversy, is like *trammelling* a Horse when he is to go a Journey; it might do well to teach him to pace, but it would be ridiculous when he is upon Service.

Upon this he runs out into a very eloquent Piece of trifling, making sad Moans and Complaints, with many Exaggerations, and great Variety of Phrases, *As if I offer'd no kind of Certainty to Mens Souls, but only that I bid those that doubt prove the contrary*; and so brings notable Parallels *of* Peter's *having twenty Pounds in his Purse, because* Paul *cannot prove he hath not*; *or his having the more Title to an Estate, because an Adversary may have the ill Luck to be non-suited.* I know not how Mr. *Godden* will take these things, for they do not seem much to his Advantage: If I were as he, I would never trust him *to play my Cards* more; for what means this Insinuation of *Non-suiting*, &c.? But Mr. *Sergeant* is plainly mistaken, for the Force of it doth not depend upon his bare *non-suiting*, but upon the *Goodness* of the *Deeds*, and the *Strength* of the *Evidence* which himself relied upon, and appear much stronger for us than for him.

It is not *Paul's not proving*, but *Peter's producing the twenty Pounds*, and laying it before him, which is the *Argument* to prove he hath it: Suppose he did not produce it *in Specie*, but shewed good *Security* for it, such as *Paul* could not deny, had he not Reason to believe he was Owner of it? There being so little Colour in the Reasoning Part, I pass over the Declamatory, as fitter for the School at the *Savoy*, than a Writer of Controversies.

But here comes in, among his Flowers, a very notable Point of Divinity: *Truth is therefore Truth, because it is built on Intrinsecal Grounds which prove it to be such*; *and not on private Mens Abilities, or their saying this or that.* This latter is undoubtedly true, and is universally believed since the School of *Pythagoras* was broken up: *Wherefore till those Grounds be produced, it cannot be with Reason held Truth.* This is

great; and becoming the *Scientifical J. Serjeant*. But will he hold to this? Will he own it to the *Cardinals* of the *Inquiſition?* I find a certain Gentleman with the very ſame Letters, *J. S.* writing two whole *Sections*, wherein he denies *that ever he medled with Intrinſec Mediums, or that it was poſſible that he ſhould.* But *P. T.* was then living, and followed him cloſe at *Rome*; now that fright is over, out come *Intrinſec Grounds* again; *and no Man can hold any thing as Truth, till thoſe Grounds be produced.* Suppoſe a Man aſſents to the Doctrine of Faith, as *True* and *Divine* on meerly *Extrinſecal Grounds*, or *Motives of Credibility*; hath this Man *true Faith* or not? Is he bound to hold and profeſs it to be true, though he doth not ſee the *Intrinſecal Grounds which prove Truth to be Truth?* Doth that Man ſin, who *profeſſes to believe a thing to be true*, though he doth not ſee the *Intrinſec Grounds* for it? What kind of ſin is it, *Mortal*, or *Venial?* How far may a Man ſafely deny that which *he cannot with Reaſon hold to be true*? How many thouſand Martyrs Lives, might this Doctrine have ſaved in the Primitive times? How might the poor Innocent Chriſtians have pleaded for themſelves; "That they could ſee no *Intrinſec Grounds*, which made "*Truth to be Truth*; and they underſtood from a deep *Divine*, that *till* "*thoſe Grounds be produced, it cannot with Reaſon be held Truth*; and if it "cannot with Reaſon be held, it may ſurely in our very hard Circum- "ſtances, with Reaſon, be denied, or at leaſt concealed and diſſem- "bled. There ſeems to be more danger in profeſſing the Faith with- "out it; than in not owning it, *being not able to produce Intrinſec Grounds* "*for it.* And theſe are far above our reach and capacity; and if it "cannot with Reaſon be held Truth without it, it ſeems very un- "reaſonable to require us to die for it.

Declaratio *J. S.* circa Doctrinam in ſuis libris contentam; exhibita Sacræ Congregationi Eccleſ. & R. D D. Cardinalium---- General. Inquiſitorum. Duaci. 1677.

What ſaith *J. Serjeant* to the Caſe of the *Jews*, who heard our *Saviour's Doctrine, and ſaw his Miracles*, did they ſin in their Infidelity or not? It will be very hard for him to prove, *that they ſaw Intrinſec Grounds* for what they were required to believe; and yet our Saviour charges them with very great Sin in their Infidelity. I hope Mr. *Serjeant* will not anſwer me, about theſe things, as he did ſome in the Conference at *Paris*, with, *Tace, Tace, interrumpis & confundis me.* This very Inſtance of the *Jews* was then brought againſt him by Dr. *Godden* and he ſaid, *That only thoſe Jews ſinned, who had clear Evidence that Chriſt's Miracles were true and Supernatural.* But *A. B.* of *D.* then urged, *That if they had ſuch Evidence, they could not have inward Unbelief, nor call in Queſtion the Truth or Divinity of Chriſt and his Miracles.* To which *J. Serjeant* replied, *Tace, nolo tibi Reſpondere.* I hope he is better provided of an Anſwer now, and that he will ſhew, wherein the ſin of the *Jews* lay; who did not profeſs Chriſt's Doctrine to be true, becauſe *they could not produce any Intrinſec Grounds for the Truth of it.*

*John* 15. 22.

*Hæreſ. Blakloan.* pag. 315, 316, 317. Page 318.

Page 6. But to return to our firſt Controverſie, *About the Certainty of Faith to be proved by us.* He tells me, *that I know well enough, that to prove Proteſtants have no Abſolute Certainty of their Faith is no hard Task even for a weak Man*; *I know*, he ſaith, *that any Man may find it confeſſed to his hands by Proteſtants*; and in the Margin he cites, *Dr.* Tillotſon's *Rule of Faith*, pag. 117, 118. I wonder at Mr. *Serjeant*'s Courage, that he dares mention that Book, to which he hath ſo many years been indebted for an Anſwer, and what he hath offer'd towards it in *Faith Vindicated, and Reaſon againſt Raillery*, he hath again retracted as to the main *Principles* of them, for fear of a *Cenſure* at *Rome*; and which he advanced

advanced out of oppoſition to thoſe of that Book which he quotes here. So that *J. Serjeant* by diſowning thoſe *Principles* of his, hath juſtified Dr. *T.* and hath overthrown the *Abſolute Certainty* of his own *Faith*. For I have already proved from his own words, *That he owns Moral Evidence to be abſolutely ſufficient for Faith*; and yet this is the very thing from whence he proves *that Proteſtants have confeſſed that they have no Abſolute Certainty of their Faith.*

But if this Matter were to be decided *by the Confeſſion of Parties*, what thinks he of thoſe of the Church of *Rome*, who have charged his Doctrine about *Infallible Certainty*, with downright *Hereſie and Impiety, and that it leads to Atheiſm and Infidelity, and overthrows the Chriſtian Faith?* This we are told is *the ſenſe of all the Learned and Orthodox Men of your Church.* Let the Reader judge what *J. Serjeant* hath gotten by the *Confeſſion* of *Parties.*

*Hæreſ. Blacklean.* p. 33. 153, &c. 323. Hæc nova propoſitio fidem Chriſtianam deſtruit impellitque ad Scepticiſmum & Atheiſmum. *Hæreſ. Blaklo.* p. 66.

Mecum omnes viri Docti & Orthodoxi ſentiunt, per tua principia vaſtum ad Atheiſmum & Hæreſin hiatum aperiri. *Hæreſ. Blackloan.* p. 200.

I hope now we ſhall come to the *State* of the *Queſtion*; for he charges me with perverting it: *The firſt Queſtion* (he ſaith) *at the Conference, was, Whether Proteſtants are abſolutely Certain, that they hold now the ſame Tenets in Faith and all that our Saviour taught to his Apoſtles.* And my Anſwer, he ſaith, was, *They are.*

By his favour, my Anſwer was not in thoſe words, "but that we "are abſolutely certain that we now hold all the ſame Doctrine that "was taught by Chriſt and his Apoſtles. And for a certain Reaſon, I deſire my own Words may expreſs my Mind; for I do not find *Oral Tradition Infallible*; and where Words are varied, the Senſe may be ſo too.

But he obſerves, *that I trick it off again*, as he calls it, (I ſuppoſe it is Gameſters Language,) *from the Point of Abſolute Certainty of Faith, to Abſolute Certainty of the Rule of Faith*, viz. *the Scripture*; *but our Saviour and Proteſtants believe more than that the Book ſo called, is Scripture. Is Certainty of this* more, *and Certainty of this Book, all one? Here is then an enquiry after one thing, plainly turned off to another.* It ſeems Mr. *Godden* is quite gone for a *Gameſter*; for he diſcerned *no Tricking* in this matter, nor can I. It is very true, we do believe *More*, than that the Book ſo called is *Scripture*; for we believe *All* the Matters of Faith contained in that Book. And what then? If by his *More*, he means Articles of Faith not contained in Scripture; then I tell him plainly, we believe *no More.* And therefore when Mr. *Godden* put his next Queſtion, as he thought very pertinently, *By what Certain Rule do you hold it?* My Anſwer was, *By the Divine Revelation contained in the Writings of the New Teſtament:* Whereby I excluded his *More*, if it be not contained in Scripture. But if by *More*, he means our Aſſent to the Points of Faith contained in Scripture, I ſhall give a full Anſwer to it afterwards. Then he asked, *By what Certain Rule do you know that the New Teſtament, which we now have, does contain all the Divine Revelations of Chriſt and his Apoſtles?* And if he puts ſuch Queſtions concerning the Rule, What *Tricking* was it in me, to give a direct Anſwer to them? How did I *turn off the Enquiry from one thing to another*, when I only Anſwered the Queſtions he propoſed? This is not *playing Mr.* Godden's *Cards*, but condemning him for *playing unskilfully*; and deſiring to begin a *new Game*; for Mr. *Godden* had a *bad hand*, and managed it very ill.

But what would *J. Serjeant* have done? *The thing to be made manifeſt by the Conference, was, the Abſolute Certainty of Proteſtant Faith.* And ſo it was; for *Proteſtant Faith* is to believe *all that is contained in Scripture, and no more.* Mr. *Godden did indeed ask ſome Queſtions about your Certainty of your Rule*; and I gave him direct Anſwers. Where is the *Tricking* in all this? *But I wiſely cut off the Courſe of the Queſtions before they had queſtion'd away the Certainty of Faith.* So far otherwiſe, that I let them alone, till they plainly run away from the buſineſs of *Certainty* to another Queſtion; and then *Mr. T. cut them off*, by declaring himſelf ſatisfied; and asking *How they could prove the Church of* Rome *to be Infallible?*

But now we are to ſee how much better the *Cards* might have been plaid. And now, look ye Gentlemen, the Man of Skill begins the Game. *After the Certainty of Scripture from Tradition was admitted, there was no Refuſing to admit that Tradition cauſes Certainty, and makes Faith as certain as Scripture.* See the difference of theſe two *Gameſters* at *Tradition!* But what if I ſhould yield him, that I will not refuſe to give my Aſſent to any Point of Faith, which comes down to us from the Apoſtles Times with *as large and as firm a Tradition as the Scripture? Then* (ſaith he) *it would have proved ſomething difficult to ſatisfie even a willing Man, that the Faith is certain which is oppoſed to a Faith come down by Tradition. Something difficult!* Nay very much ſo, without doubt. But this is fairly to ſuppoſe, that you have as *Univerſal a Tradition* for your *Tridentine Faith*, as we have for the *Scripture*; but this I utterly deny; and I hope in another *Treatiſe* to ſhew, I have not done it without Reaſon. Let the Matter of Tradition itſelf, as a *Rule of Faith*, be one of theſe Points. If there were a *Conſtant Univerſal Tradition* in the *Chriſtian Church* from the *Apoſtolical Times*, that there were *Matters of Faith* neceſſary to Salvation not contained in Scripture, I grant that it would be difficult, to prove it to be a Matter of Faith that Scripture alone is our Rule of Faith. But that is the mighty Advantage of our Cauſe, that we have both *Scripture* and *Tradition* for us; and that no *Catholick Tradition* can be produced againſt us, in any one Point of the *Additional Creed* of *Pius* IV. which is the Deſign I have undertaken, of which I ſhall ſuddenly publiſh the *Firſt Part*; and if God gives me Life and Health, I hope to go through the Reſt. Well; *but in the mean time, Abſolute Certainty of Scripture was not the Point of the Conference.* Can *J. Serjeant* tell better than the Managers? His meaning is, it ought not to have been. *Nor is it the Point of Concern.* This is ſtrange. Not *the Point of Concern* to thoſe that own it to be *the Word of God, and the only Rule of Faith!* It is of *Infinite Concern* to us; if it be not to you, I pity you for it.

*Beſides that, it is agreed on all hands, Men are ſaved by Believing and Practiſing what Chriſt taught, not barely by believing Scripture is Scripture.* This is no New Speculation; But what follows from it? *Therefore we ought to believe Chriſt's Doctrine contained in Scripture, and obey his Commands*; and do I give the leaſt Intimation againſt this? But, the Queſtion was about our *Rule of Faith*, and that I ſtill think is the *Scripture*; and whatever is contained therein, is to be believed on that Account. *But Salvation is the thing that imports us in theſe Diſputes, and 'twere well if nothing elſe were minded by Diſputers.* And ſo think I too. I deſire no more to end our Controverſies, than to make *Salvation* our End, and the *Scripture* our *Rule.* But how can *Salvation be the thing*

*that*

*that imports us in these Disputes*, if *Men cannot with Reason hold any thing true, unless they can produce the Intrinsecal Grounds which prove it to be so?* Doth Mr. *Serjeant* in earnest think, that none are saved but *Metaphysical Speculators*, that *perch upon the specifick Nature of Things*, and dig into the *Intrinsecal Grounds of Truth?* If this be his Opinion, *How few can be saved!* But if *Salvation* be the End, the *Means* must be suitable to the Capacity of Mankind; and I do not think, *the Intrinsecal Grounds of Truth* are so.

But after all, he saith, *that I stifle any further talk of the Certainty of Protestant Faith.* How can that be, when I own no *Protestant Faith* but what is contained in Scripture, or may be deduced from it; according to the Sixth Article of our Church. I am not conscious to myself of *any Art in the matter*, which he charges me with; and he saith, *I avoid what cannot be performed.* What is that? *To make out that Protestants are absolutely certain that they now hold all the same Doctrine that was taught by Christ and his Apostles.* If all that Doctrine be contained in Scripture, and they hold the Scripture by Grounds of *Absolute Certainty*, then Protestants must be certain *that they hold all the same Doctrine that was taught by Christ and his Apostles.*

Afterwards Mr. *Serjeant* starts something that comes nearer to the business; which is, *that Certainty of Faith and Certainty of Scripture, are two things: For those who have as much Certainty of Scripture as we, may have not only an Uncertain but a Wrong Faith; and therefore I am concerned to shew, not only that Protestants have Certainty of their Rule, but of the Faith which they pretend to have from that Rule*: That which I am now upon, is to settle the *true State* of the Controversie about the *Certainty of Faith.* In the *Conference*, my first Answer was, that, *We are absolutely Certain that we now hold all the same Doctrine, that was taught by Christ and his Apostles.* And when the Question was asked, *By what Certain Rule do we hold it?* I answer'd, *By the Divine Revelation contained in the Writings of the New Testament.* So that the *Certainty of Scripture* was that which I was obliged to answer to. Now comes *J. Serjeant* and he finds fault with Mr. *Godden*'s management; because he asked Questions about the *Certainty of the Rule*; whereas he ought to have gone another Way to work. So that now Mr. *Godden* is given up, and a New Controversie is begun upon other *Grounds*; and the Words which I used with Respect to the *Rule*, are applied to particular *Doctrines.* He saith, *The Certainty of Scripture was not the Point for which the Conference was.* How comes he to know better than Mr. *Godden* unless he directed the Point, and Mr. *Godden* mistook and lost it in the Management? *But I am now bound to manifest, that Protestants have Absolute Certainty, not only of the Scripture, as the Rule, but of the Faith they have from that Rule, or else to own that I cannot.* It seems Mr. *Godden*'s *good Nature* betray'd him, when he asked Questions about *the Rule of Faith*; and so the main Point was lost. Yet methinks it was not meer good Nature in Mr. *Godden.* For, when we are asked, about the Grounds and Certainty of our Faith, how is it possible we should answer more pertinently, than to assign the *Rule* of our *Faith?* And we declare it to be the Scripture, by which we judge what we are to believe, and what not. And therefore if any ask us of *the Matter of our Faith*, we must answer, It is whatever God hath revealed in the *Scripture* which is our *Rule.* If they ask us, *How we come to know these Books to be written by such Persons, we* say, It is *by the Universal*

*Tradition*

*Tradition of the Chriſtian Churches.* If they ask us, *Why we believe the Doctrine contained in thoſe Books?* Then our Anſwer is, *From the Divine Teſtimonies, which make us certain that it came from God.* And thus we anſwer both to that which is called the *Material* and *Formal Object of Faith*; and if we are *abſolutely certain* of theſe, we muſt be ſo of our *Faith.* If we ask a *Jew* about the *Certainty* of his *Faith*, he ſaith he is certain of it becauſe all his Faith is contained in the *Books* of *Moſes*, and he is well aſſured they were written by Divine Inſpiration. If we ask a *Mahometan* of his *Faith*, his Anſwer is, That his *Faith* is contained in the *Alcoran*; and by proving that, he proves the *Certainty of his Faith*; and if that be diſproved, the *Certainty* of it is overthrown. Thoſe who reſolve their Faith into a written Rule, muſt go thither when Queſtions are asked them about the *Certainty* of their *Faith.* For, if I believe every thing in it, and nothing but what is in it, there lies my *Faith*, and the *Certainty* of it depends upon the *Certainty* of my *Rule.* *But I muſt ſhew the Certainty of the Faith of Proteſtants, as it is pretended to be taken from the Rule.* Not certainly, when the Queſtion is asked about the *entire Object* of our *Faith*, or when we are to ſhew how *we hold all the ſame Doctrine that was taught by Chriſt and his Apoſtles*; for the Word *All* makes it neceſſary for us to aſſign our *Rule* wherein that *All* is contained. If he ask us of the Certainty of any particular Point of our Faith, then we are to make it out, that this is contained in our *Rule*; and our *Certainty* is according to the *Evidence* we are able to produce for it.

For the Caſe is not the ſame, as to *particular Points* of *Faith*, with that of the *general Grounds* of the *Certainty* of *Faith.* A *Jew* firmly believes all that is contained in the Books of *Moſes*, and with the higheſt Degree of *Certainty*; but whether the *Reſurrection* can be proved certainly from thoſe *Books*, is a particular Point; and he may have *Abſolute Certainty* of all contained in thoſe Books, though he may not have it as to ſuch a particular Point. And when we come to particular *Points*, their Caſe is not only different from the *General Rule* of *Faith*, but ſuch *Points* are very different both among themſelves, and as to the *Certainty* of them.

For, (1.) There are ſome *Points* of *Faith*, which were *neceſſary to be Revealed, becauſe they were neceſſary to be Believed, in order to our Salvation by Jeſus Chriſt.* For as Mr. *Serjeant* ſaith, *Salvation is the thing of greateſt Importance*; and therefore on Suppoſition, that it is to be by *Jeſus Chriſt*, the Nature of the thing requires, that we have a firm and eſtabliſhed Faith in him. And of theſe *Points of Faith*, the Church hath given a Summary in the *Creeds*, which were propoſed to thoſe who were to be baptized; and not only St. *Auguſtin*, but *Aquinas* ſaith, *theſe were taken out of Scripture*; and the *Certainty* of them to us, doth depend not upon the *Authority* of the *Church* propoſing them, but the *Evidence* of *Scripture* for them, which is very much confirmed to us by the *concurrent Teſtimony* of the Chriſtian Church in all ages from the Apoſtles times, *i. e.* as to the *main Articles*; for that there was a great Variety, as to others, is evident to any one who will compare the *Ancient Creeds*, as I have lately ſhewed. And theſe main Articles are thoſe which *Aquinas* calls the *prima Credibilia*; which are therefore revealed, becauſe neceſſary to be believed by all that hope for Salvation by *Jeſus Chriſt.*

2. 2. a 9. *ad* 1.

(2) There

(2.) There are other *Points* of *Faith*, which are *only neceſſary to be believed, becauſe they are ſo clearly revealed*; as that *Caiaphas* was *High-Prieſt* when Chriſt ſuffered; that there were *two Malefactors who ſuffer'd with him*; that he was bury'd in *Joſeph of Arimathea's Sepulchre*: No Man who believes the *Scripture* can doubt of theſe things, and yet we do not make theſe *Points* of *Faith* in themſelves neceſſary, becauſe they have no immediate Reference to *Salvation*, which might have been as effectually carried on, if there had been another High-Prieſt, or Chriſt had lain in another *Sepulchre*. But in theſe Points there is an *abſolute Certainty* from the unqueſtionable *Evidence* of their being contained in Scripture.

(3.) There are *doctrinal Points* not neceſſary to Salvation, about which ſome may attain to a greater Degree of *Certainty* than others. And the ſame Meaſure is not required of all, becauſe Mens Capacities are not equal, if they do uſe equal Diligence; and all are not obliged to the ſame Degrees of Diligence that ſome are. As to the Points *neceſſary to Salvation*, God is not wanting by his Grace to make them known to Men of honeſt and ſincere Minds. And this is no peculiar Doctrine of mine, as *J. Serjeant* would inſinuate, but it hath been the conſtant Doctrine of their moſt Learned and Judicious *School-Divines*, as is evident from what they ſpeak of the *Donum Intellectus*, and the *Lumen Fidei*, which ſecure Men from Error in what concerns their Salvation. If he hath therefore ſuch an inveterate Spleen againſt this Doctrine, let him attack the greateſt Divines of the Church of *Rome*, who have in Terms aſſerted the ſame which I have done. And I would fain ſee *J. Serjeant* demonſtrating againſt *Aquinas* and all his Followers, *That there is no ſuch Security from Error in Points neceſſary to Salvation, where-ever God beſtows true Grace* As to *Points not neceſſary to Salvation*, I do not affirm there is any ſuch *Ground* of *Abſolute Certainty*, as to *particular Perſons*, who are only concerned as to their own *Salvation*. And that was the Reaſon of my Anſwer to the fourth Queſtion: "The univerſal Teſtimony of the "Chriſtian Church, concerning the Book of Scripture, and the Do-"ctrine contained therein, is a ſufficient Ground to make us certain "of all Matters neceſſary to our Salvation. But of this more afterwards. It is ſufficient here to obſerve, that even in the Church of *Rome*, there are *Points* of *Doctrine* which are not *de Fide*, and conſequently the *Certainty* of *Faith* is not required to them. And then it is moſt unreaſonable to require the *Abſolute Certainty* of *Faith* in thoſe things which we deny to be *Points* of *Faith*. It is as if we ſhould ask them what *Abſolute Certainty* of *Faith* they have, as to the *Immaculate Conception* and *Aſſumption* of the Bleſſed *Virgin*, or the *Pope's Infallibility*, they would tell us, theſe are no *Points* of *Faith* with them, and therefore it is unreaſonable to ask after the *Abſolute Certainty* of *Faith*, where there is no *Faith* pretended. The ſame we ſay in the like Caſe; It is very abſurd to demand of us the *Abſolute Certainty* of our *Faith* in ſuch things, wherein we never pretend to a *Certainty* of *Faith*, but of

Sed circa ea quæ ſunt de Neceſſitate Salutis ſufficienter inſtruuntur à Spiritu Sancto. 2. 2. 9. 8. *a* 4. *ad* 1.

Donum intellectus nunquam ſe ſubtrahit ſanctis circa ea quæ ſunt neceſſaria ad ſalutem, ſed circa alia interdum ſe ſubtrahit. *ib. ad* 3.

*A.* 3. dicendum quod Lumen Fidei facit videre ea quæ creduntur--- ita per habitum Fidei inclinatur mens hominis ad aſſentiendum his quæ conveniunt certæ Fidei & non aliis. 2. 2. 9. 1. *a* 4. *ad* 3.

Per lumen Fidei divinitus infuſum homini homo aſſentit his quæ ſunt Fidei, non autem contrariis; & ideo nihil periculi vel damnationis ineſt his qui ſunt in Chriſto Jeſu, ab ipſo illuminati per fidem. 2. 2. 9. 2. *a* 3. *ad* 2.

of common Senſe and Reaſon, proceeding according to the *Rule* of *Scripture*. As, if Men impoſe falſe and abſurd Doctrines upon us, as *Tranſubſtantiation*, &c. we inſiſt upon the *Common Right* of *Mankind*, not to be required to believe *Contradictions*; and the *Right of Chriſtians*, not to believe what hath neither *Scripture*, nor *Reaſon*, nor *Tradition* for it. And theſe are the *Grounds* on which we reject the *Additional Creed* of *Pius* the Fourth. We make them no *Points* of *Faith* at all; and if others do make them ſo, we deſire to be excuſed, becauſe it is as certain to us they are not ſo, as we can be of *Negatives*: And farther than this we go not in ſuch *Points*; and if this be what he means by *Proteſtant Faith*, he hath my Anſwer.

IV. The *General Reaſon* of the *Certainty of Faith* in particular Perſons, is not from *concluſive Evidence* as to the *Points* of *Faith*, but from ſome higher Cauſe. And this Mr. *Serjeant* ought to know hath been the conſtant *Doctrine* of the *Schools*, ever ſince Divinity hath been brought into them. I except only one *Franciſcus de Marchia*, who required concluſive Evidence to the *Certainty* of Faith, but he is diſputed againſt by *Gregorius Ariminenſis*; and he ſaith, *His Doctrine was condemned by the Faculty of* Paris; and *Gregory de Valentia* ſpeaks of him with great Contempt for holding ſo abſurd a Doctrine.

Greg. Ariminenſ. *D.* 1. *A.* 4. & 1. Greg. de Valentia. *Tom.* 3. *Diſp.* 1. Q. 1. *Part* 4. Hugo de Sancto Victore Sum. ſent. *l.* 1. *c.* 1. De Sacram. *l.* 1. *p.* 11 *c.* 2. 4. Rich. de Sancto Victor. Declar. *Part.* 1. *p.* 373. Petr. Pictavienſ. Sentent. *Part* 3. *c.* 21. Gul. Pariſienſ de Fide. *c.* 1. Gul. Antiſſiodor. Sum. in Præf. & *l.* 3. *Tit.* Q. 2. Alex. Alenſ. *Part.* 1. Q. 2. *M.* 3. *A.* 4. *Part.* 3. Q. 68. *M.* 2. *A.* 2. Bonavent. *l.* 3. *D.* 23. Q. 4. Aquin. 1. q. 46. a. 2. in C. 1, 2. q 32. A. 1. in B. 2. 2. q. 2. a. 1. ad 1. q. 1. a. 4. ad 3. q. 2. a. 3. q. 5. a. 4. C. Henr. Gandav. Sum. Art. 7. Q. 2. N. 6, 7, 8. Art. 9. Q. 3. N. 13. A. 10. Q. 1. N. 4, 5. Scot. in Sentent. L. 3. Q. 23. N. 14, 15

*The Certainty of Faith* is declared by the ancient *School-men* to be *above Opinion, and below Science*: By which they underſtood *the intrinſec Grounds on which Truth is built*; which Mr. *Serjeant* makes neceſſary to the Profeſſion of it.

*Hugo de Sancto Victore* ſaith, *That the higheſt Certainty of Faith is owing to a pious and pure Diſpoſition of the Mind, and an immediate Divine Influence.*

*Petrus Pictavienſis*, *That it lies not in Evidence but Adherence.*

*Guliel. Pariſienſis proves concluſive Evidence* repugnant to Faith, in a long Diſcourſe.

*Gul. Antiſſiodorenſis* thinks *rational Evidence good to ſupport and defend the Faith, and to prepare Men for it: But that the Certainty of it lies not in Speculation, but in an Adherence of the Mind to the prime Verity.*

*Alex. Alenſis* ſaith likewiſe, *Its Certainty doth not lie in Speculation, but in inward Affection and Adherence*; *there is*, he ſaith, *an inferiour ſort of Acquiſite Faith, which relies on Reaſons and Teſtimonies, but this*, he ſaith, *is meerly natural and preparatory to Divine Faith.*

*Bonaventure* ſaith, *the Certainty of Adherence is beyond that of Speculation, becauſe a Martyr may have Doubts, and yet die for his Faith.*

*Thomas Aquinas* thinks, *thoſe that go about to bring Demonſtrations for Faith, expoſe it to the Scorn and Reproach of Infidels*; and he reſolves *the inward Certainty of Faith into Divine Illumination*, when the Objection was put, *That Matters of Faith could not be reſolved into firſt Principles*; which Mr. *Serjeant* hath ſo long and ſo vainly pretended to.

*Henricus Gandavenſis* ſaith, *There is a Certainty of Adherence in the Habit of Faith*; *and that the Evidence of Credibility falls much ſhort of that of Science*; *and he makes Scripture the Rule, whereby we are to judge of the Doctrine of the preſent Church, and of all Ages ſucceeding the Apoſtles.*

*Scotus* diſtinguiſheth *between Acquiſite and Human Faith, and Divine or Infuſed Faith*; but he denies any *Infallibility* to belong to the former.

*Du-*

*Durandus* denies *Faith to be consistent with conclusive Evidence*; and *that the Motives of Credibility affords such Evidence, because that necessitates Assent.* And it is observable, that he resolves *Faith* not into the *Testimony* of the *present*, but of the *Apostolical Church.* Durand Prolog. Q. 1. N. 43, 46. L. 3. Dist. 24. Q. 3. N. 8, 9.

I need produce no more, to shew what a Stranger Mr. *Serjeant* is to the *Doctrine* of his own *Church*; or else what an obstinate Opposer he is of it. But this is sufficient to shew what *Grounds* of the *Certainty of Faith* are allowed by the Chief Divines of the Church of *Rome*, and how very different they are from those of the *Catholick Letters.* To summ up briefly therefore the *State* of this *Controversie* about the *Certainty* of our *Faith.*

I. I assert, That we are *Absolutely Certain* of the *Formal Object* of our *Faith*, viz. that *whatever God reveals, is True, and to be professed by us, though we do not see the Intrinsick Grounds of it.*

II. We are *Absolutely Certain* of the *Infallible Rule of our Faith*; and that *All* the necessary Points of Faith, in order to the Salvation of Mankind, are therein contained.

III. The *General Certainty* of *Divine Faith* in true Believers, according to their own Divines, doth not depend upon *Conclusive Evidence*, or *Intrinsick Grounds*, but an inward Perception caused by Divine Grace.

IV. *Particular Points* of *Faith* are more or less *Certain*, according to the *Evidence* of their Deduction from *Sripture* as the *Rule* of *Faith.*

V. Where any *Propositions* are imposed as *Points* of *Faith*, which others deny, those who impose are bound to prove the *Certainty* of them as such, and not those who reject them.

And this is our Case as to the Points in Difference between us and those of the Church of *Rome:* We do not make the *Negatives* any *Point of our Faith*, any further than as the *Scripture is our Rule*, and we cannot be bound consequently to receive any thing as a *Point of Faith*, but what is contained in it, or deduced from it. But the Church of *Rome* requiring us to receive them as *Points* of *Faith*, is bound to prove the *Certainty* of them as such.

Having thus endeavoured to set this Controversie about the *Certainty of Faith* in its true Light, I now proceed to consider what Mr. *Serjeant* doth object against it. And I shall conceal nothing that looks like an Argument. His Raillery I despise, and his Impertinencies I shall pass over.

I. That which looks most like an Argument, is, what he hath set out by way of *Propositions* in his *First Letter.*

1. *God hath left us some way to know what surely Christ and his Apostles taught.*

2. *Therefore this way must be such, that they who take it, shall arrive by it at the End it was intended for*; i. e. *know surely what Christ and his Apostles taught.*

3. *Scriptures Letter interpretable by Private Judgments, is not that way; for we experience Presbyterians and Socinians (for Example) both take that way, yet differ in such high Fundamentals, as the Trinity and the God-head of Christ.*

4. *Therefore Scriptures Letter interpretable by Private Judgments, is not the way left by God to know surely what Christ and his Apostles taught, or surely to arrive at Right Faith.*

5. *Therefore they who take only that way, cannot by it arrive ſurely at right Faith, ſince 'tis impoſſible to arrive at the End, without the means or way that leads to it.*

Upon ſetting down this, Mr. *Serjeant* being ſenſible he had plaid his *beſt Cards*, cannot help a little expreſſing the Satisfaction he had in the *Goodneſs* of his *Game*. *I do not* (ſaith he) *expect any Anſwer to this Diſcourſe, as ſhort as it is, and as plain, and as nearly as it touches your Copy-hold.* Alas for me, that am fallen into the hands of ſuch a Gameſter! But I am reſolved to diſappoint him, and to give him a *clear* and *full Anſwer* to this ſhew of Reaſoning. And that ſhall be, by making it appear,

I. That it proceeds upon Falſe Suppoſitions.

II. That it deſtroys any Rule of Faith, even his own admired *Oral* and *Practical Tradition.*

I. That it proceeds upon Falſe Suppoſitions. As,

1. That no *Certainty* can be attained where there is no *Infallibility.* For if Men may arrive at *Certainty* where there is a general *Poſſibility* of *Deception*, all this ſeeming *Demonſtration* comes to nothing. And yet this is a thing all Mankind are agreed in, who allow any ſuch thing as *Certainty*; and the contrary Opinion was (which Mr. *Serjeant* little thinks) the very Foundation of *Scepticiſm*; viz. *That there could be no Certainty, unleſs Men could find out ſuch an Infallible Mark of Truth, which could not agree to what was Falſe*; as he might have learned in *Cicero*'s *Lucullus*, without ſending him to *Pyrrho*'s Scholars. And till *Zeno* and his Diſciples pretended to find out this, *Scepticiſm* gained little Ground; but when they yielded to that Principle, That no *Certainty* was to be had without it, then a mighty Advantage was given them, which they improved accordingly. But the more Judicious Philoſophers were forced to quit the *Stoicks Infallible Mark*, and to proceed upon ſuch Evidence of Perception, and Senſe, and Ratiocination, as might, in things not Self-evident, form an Aſſent which excludes all reaſonable Doubt of the contrary. But ſtill thoſe who pretended to *Infallibility*, were the moſt deceived. As *Epicurus* thought there could be no *Certainty* in *Senſe*, unleſs it were made *Infallible*; and from hence he ran into that groſs Abſurdity, that the Sun was really no bigger than he ſeemed to be to our Senſes. For, he went juſt upon Mr. *Serjeant*'s Principles, *If there be a poſſibility of Deception, there can be no True Certainty*; and to make good his *Hypotheſis*, the Sun muſt be no bigger than a Bonfire. But the Wiſer Philoſophers took in the Aſſiſtance of *Reaſon*, which, though not Infallible, might give ſuch Evidence, as afforded *Certainty*, where it fell ſhort of *Demonſtration.* As in *Phyſical* and *Moral* things. I grant, that ſome of thoſe who talked moſt and beſt of *Demonſtration*, fell wonderfully ſhort of it, when they came to apply *Notions* to *Things*; and the *Demonſtrations* they made were to little or no purpoſe, in the promoting of Knowledge, as, that *Man is a Rational Creature*, &c. But their *Phyſical Speculations* are very far from it; yet this doth not hinder but that a *Certainty* is attainable, as to the Nature of Things. And in *Morals*, they knew and confeſſed there could be no *Demonſtration* in them; yet they profeſſed a *true Certainty* they had as to the *Nature* of *Happineſs*, and the real *Differences* of *Vertue* and *Vice*: They owned ſome *Moral Principles* to be *Abſolutely Certain*, as *that Good is to be choſen, and Evil to be avoided*, &c. but in particular Caſes, they made uſe of the beſt Reaſon they had, to prove ſome things Good, and

others

others Evil. And although they could not proceed with equal *Certainty* in all *Vertues* and *Vices*; yet in ſome they had clear *Evidence*, and in others they made uſe of the beſt means to give Satisfaction to themſelves and others.

Thus it is in *Matters* of *Faith*, there are ſome things *Abſolutely Certain*; as, that *God cannot deceive us*; that *the Scripture is our Rule of Faith*; but then, whether ſuch Points be contained in that Rule and be of *Divine Revelation*, is not Self-evident; and therefore theſe muſt be deduced by all the beſt Methods of *Reaſoning* from a *written Rule*; and when Perſons have examined the Scripture with all the Care and Diligence, which one who would arrive at *Certainty* thinks himſelf obliged to, then I do affirm, that ſuch a Man may attain to a true *Certainty and Satisfaction* of Mind about it. And that *true Certainty* is attainable without *Infallibility*, I ſhall prove by an undeniable Inſtance (if an Inſtance will be allowed; and I hope I ſhall make it appear as reaſonable for me to produce *Inſtances* as himſelf,) and that is, concerning a *Point of Faith* of the greateſt Importance, *viz. That Jeſus Chriſt was the true Meſſias foretold by the Prophets.* The Proof of this depended on the *Interpretation* of *Scripture*; and there could be no Infallible Interpreter relied upon in this Caſe. As to *Chriſt himſelf*, although he really was ſo, yet we ſuppoſe the Queſtion to be about him, whether he were an *Infallible Teacher* or not; and therefore we muſt not ſuppoſe the thing to be proved. As to the *Publick Interpretation*, which Mr. *Serjeant* makes his *Infallible Rule*, if that were to be relied upon, then a *Jew* was bound not to believe Chriſt to be the *true Meſſias*, becauſe the *Publick Interpretation* was againſt him; and the *Traditional Senſe* of the *Prophecies* was againſt him, being for a Temporal Prince; I now demand of Mr. *Serjeant* whether the *Jews* were capable of *Certainty* in this Point or not? If not, then the *Jews* were excuſed in their Infidelity: If they were, then true Certainty may be had without an Infallible Guide, although the *Publick Interpretation* and *Tradition* be againſt it. And if it may be had in ſo difficult a Caſe, which depended on the *Senſe* of *obſcure Prophecies*; much more certainly under the clear Revelation of the Goſpel; wherein all *Neceſſary Points* are laid down with ſo much Clearneſs, that the Fault muſt be more in Mens *Wills* than their *Underſtandings*, if they do not apprehend them.

2. The Second falſe Suppoſition is, *That a Rule of Faith* muſt be a *Mechanical Rule*, and not a *Rational*; *i. e.* It muſt be like a *Carpenters* Rule, that hath all its Dimenſions fixed, and ready to be applied to Material things; but in matters of Underſtanding no ſuch Rule is to be expected. The *Philoſophers* who diſputed ſo much about *Certainty*, would have laughed at any Man who had applied a *Material Rule* to Intellectual things; yet this is Mr. *Serjeant*'s great Example: *I take my Rule*, ſaith he, *and draw a Line by it; does the ſtreightneſs or crookedneſs of this Line depend upon my Underſtanding?* By no means. But is there any ſuch *Intellectual Rule* as this? There have been great Diſputes in the World, among Men of Wit and Subtilty, about the *Certainty* of Human Knowledge; Whether any Infallible *Criterion* could be found to diſcern Truth and Falſhood? But they never imagined any ſuch thing as an *Intellectual Ruler to draw Lines by*; but that there were certain Differences of Truth and Falſhood, which Men might find out, but not without Diligence and Application of their Minds to it. And notwithſtanding the Characters of Truth and Falſhood were in themſelves Certain, yet it was very poſſible for Men to miſtake about them; not

*Second Letter*, p. 25.

only for want of Judgment, but of Diligence and Impartiality: So we ſay here as to a *Rule* of *Faith*; we do not ſuppoſe it to be a *Material Rule*; *i. e.* If a Man take the *Letter of Scripture*, and apply it to any Opinions, he muſt preſently know whether they be true or falſe; but it is a *Rational* and *Intellectual Rule*, which is *abſolutely Certain* in it ſelf; and whatever agrees to it is *True*, and whatever doth not is falſe: But ſtill there may be miſtakes in the *Underſtanding* and *Applying* it; and therefore *Care*, and *Diligence*, and *Impartiality*, are required; by which ſome may attain to that *Certainty*, which others miſs off. As in the *Points* he mentions of *the Presbyterians and Socinians differing about ſuch high Fundamentals, as the Trinity and God-head of Chriſt.*

1. Why *Presbyterians* and *Socinians*, I beſeech him? There is a notable Inſinuation in this, as though we of the *Church* of *England* were *Socinians* in thoſe Points; and none but *Papiſts* and *Presbyterians* were Orthodox in them. But this is an Inſinuation which hath as much Folly as Malice in it; ſince our ſolemn and expreſs Declarations, are to the contrary: And he may as well call us *Papiſts* as *Socinians*, ſince our Writings are as plainly againſt one, as the other. What our Senſe as to theſe Matters is, he may find in the *Dialogues* of the *Doctrine of the Trinity and Tranſubſtantiation compared*; not long ſince Publiſhed by a *Divine* of the *Church of England*. But to paſs this over. 2. Suppoſe the *Difference* between us and the *Socinians*. What then? *Both take the ſame way of Scriptures Letter Interpretable by private Judgments, and yet differ in theſe Fundamental Points.* And what follows? That the *Scripture* is no Certain Rule? By no means. But that the *Socinians* may err, and certainly do in miſinterpreting this Rule. *But how can it be a certain Rule, if men that uſe it may err in uſing it?* How can Reaſon be certain in any thing, if Men following Reaſon may miſtake? How can *Arithmetick* be a *certain way of computation*, if Men following the *Rules* of *Arithmetick*, may miſtake in caſting up a *ſum*? Doth any Man queſtion the *Certainty* of the *Rule*, for Mens blundering in their Accompts? yet this is his way of Reaſoning. And I will put it juſt with his Propoſitions.

I. *Arithmetick preſcribes a Certain way by Addition and Subſtraction for us to find out any Sum.*

II. *Therefore it muſt be ſuch, that they who take it, ſhall arrive by it, at the exact Sum.*

III. *But two Men who have made uſe of the ſame way, differ at leaſt a hundred in caſting up the Sum.*

IV. *Therefore Arithmetick doth not preſcribe a certain way to attain at a Certain Sum.*

V. *Therefore they who take only that way, cannot by it arrive at the Certain Sum.*

Is not this clear and evident Demonſtration? But thoſe who conſider a little better than Mr. *Serjeant* hath done, will diſtinguiſh between the *Rule* and the *Application* of it. The *Rule* of *Arithmetick* may be nevertheleſs *Certain*, although thoſe who want Skill, or Care and Diligence, may miſtake in caſting up a particular Accompt.

The ſame we ſay here, *Scripture* is a *certain Rule* in all *Fundamental Points*, to ſuch as have Capacity, and uſe due Care and Diligence in finding them. But we do not deny, but Men through Prejudice, Weakneſs, want of Attention, Authority of falſe Teachers, Impatience of thoroughly examining things, and not uſing proper Helps, may

may run into groſs Errors; ſuch as theſe about the *Trinity* and *Incarnation*: But ſtill the *Rule* is certain to thoſe who uſe it aright, altho it be very poſſible for Men, through their own Faults, to miſtake about it.

And this is no way diſagreeing to the infinite Wiſdom of God, who deals with us as with Rational Creatures; and hath put Faculties into us, that we might uſe them in order to the *Certainty* of our *Faith*. And ſuch *Moral Qualifications* are required in the *New Teſtament*, in order to the diſcerning the Doctrine of it, as *Humility of Mind*, *Purity of Heart*, *Prayer to God*, *ſincere Endeavour to do the Will of God*; that it would be very repugnant to the Deſign of it, to ſuppoſe that *the Letter of Scripture* alone would give a Man immediate and certain Directions in all Matters of Doctrine being applied to it. Therefore an eaſy Anſwer is to be given to Mr. *Serjeant*'s great Difficulty, *viz. How the Senſe drawn from the Letter can any more fail to be true, than the Line drawn by the Rule to be ſtraight.* For we ſay, *That the Senſe truly drawn from the Scripture, can never fail to be true*; but we do not ſay, that every Man muſt draw the *True Senſe* from the *Scripture*; for although the *Scripture* be an *Infallible Rule*, yet unleſs every Man that makes uſe of it be *Infallible*, he may miſtake in the *Application* of it. And this to me is ſo clear, that to make an *Infallible Rule* in his Senſe, he muſt make every Perſon that uſes it *Infallible*, or elſe he may err in the *Application* of it: *But the right Way*, ſaith Mr. *Serjeant*, *will certainly bring a Man to his Journey's End, and the Way muſt needs be a wrong Way if it do it not.* The *Right Way* will certainly bring them to their Journey's End, if they continue in it; but here we muſt conſider what is meant by the *Journey's End*. If by it be underſtood their *Salvation*, then we ſay, that thoſe who do their utmoſt Endeavours to keep in that way, ſhall not fail of their *Journey's End*. But if by it be underſtood *the certain Truth or Falſhood of every Opinion tried by the Scripture*; then I anſwer, that although the Senſe of Scripture be infallibly true, yet it was not deſigned as an *Infallible Way* for us to know the *Truth* and *Falſhood* of all particular *Opinions* by. For as Mr. *Serjeant* well obſerves, *Salvation is that which chiefly imports us*; and it was for that End the Doctrine of Chriſt is made known to us, and it is an *Infallible Way* to it, if Men continue therein: But for judging the *Truth* or *Falſhood* of *Opinions*, without reſpect to *Salvation* as the *End*, it was not intended as an *Infallible Way* to every one that makes uſe of it; and therefore it is eaſy for Men to miſtake in judging by it of things it was not deſign'd for. As if a Man deſigned to obſerve all the *old Roman Cities and Stations* here, and were told the *old Roman Way* would be a *certain Way* to lead him to them, with the Help of the *Roman Itenerary*; if that Man objects, that this will not do, for he cannot find out all the *Modern Towns* and *Villages* by this Means, is it not a juſt and reaſonable Anſwer to ſay, that is a moſt *certain Way*, which leads a Man to that which it was deſign'd for; and the *Roman Way* was only intended for *Roman Foundations*; but it is very unreaſonable to find Fault with it, becauſe it doth not lead you to all modern Towns and Villages. So ſay I here: The *Scripture* was deſigned by Divine Wiſdom to make us *wiſe to Salvation*; and thither it will infallibly lead us, if we keep to it: But if beſides this we would know by it ſuch things as are not neceſſary to Salvation, we blame it for that, which was not in the *Original Intention and Deſign* of it. For when we make uſe of it to be our *Rule* of Judgment, meerly as to Truth

Second Letter, *pag.* 6.

Truth and Falſhood of things not neceſſary to Salvation; it is not becauſe it was deſigned for that End, but becauſe it is of *Divine Revelation*, and ſo is the ſureſt Standard of *Divine Truth*; and we are ſure there is no other Rule for us to judge by beſides. From whence we may and ought to reject any *Points* of *Faith* impoſed upon us, which are neither contained in Scripture, nor can be proved from it. And ſo it is our poſitive *Rule of Faith*, as to all *neceſſary Articles*; and our *negative Rule*, as to all *pretended Points of Faith*, which are not proved from thence.

II. I anſwer, That this Method of Mr. *Serjeant* will overthrow the *Poſſibility* of any *Rule of Faith*; becauſe none can be aſſigned, which it is not poſſible for Men to miſapprehend, and to miſtake about it. Let us at preſent ſuppoſe Mr. *Serjeant* to ſubſtitute his *Rule of Faith* inſtead of *Scripture*, viz. *Oral and Practical Tradition.* Why may not Men miſtake the *Senſe* of *Tradition*, as well as the *Senſe* of *Scripture?* Is *Tradition* more *Infallible* in it ſelf? Is it deliver'd by Perſons more *Infallible?* Doth it make thoſe to whom it is deliver d *Infallible?* Why then may not thoſe who deliver it, and thoſe who receive it, both be miſtaken about it?

This I had mention'd in my *ſecond Letter*, that it was very poſſible to miſtake the *Senſe and Meaning of Tradition*; and I inſtanced in that of *Chriſt's being the Son of God*, where the Traditionary Words may be kept, and yet an *Heretical Senſe* may be contained under them. Mr. *Serjeant* anſwers, *That the Senſe of the Words, and all the reſt of Chriſt's Doctrine, is conveyed down by Tradition.* This is bravely ſaid, if it could be made out, and would preſently put an End to all Diſputes. For if all the Doctrine of Chriſt be derived down to us in ſuch a manner, that we cannot miſtake the *Senſe* of it, we muſt be all agreed whether we will or not. For how can we diſagree, if we cannot miſtake the *Senſe* of *Tradition? Not while we hold to Tradition.* Then it ſeems it is poſſible not to hold to *Tradition*; and if ſo, we have found a terrible Flaw in *Human Nature*, that will let in Errors in abundance, *viz.* that it may groſly err about the Rule of Faith; yea, ſo far as to renounce it. But how is this poſſible, if the *Senſe of Tradition be infallibly conveyed?* For is not *Tradition's being the Rule of Faith* any part of it? We muſt in Reaſon ſuppoſe this: And if we do ſo, how can Perſons renounce its being the *Rule*, while they cannot but believe its being the Rule? If Men may miſtake about *Tradition's* being the *Rule of Faith*, why may we not ſuppoſe, they may as well miſtake about any *Points* convey'd by it? For the greateſt Security lying in the *Rule*, there muſt be more Care taken about that, than about the Points convey'd by it.

Second Letter to Mr. *Godden*, p. 7.

Third Catholick Letter, *pag.* 6.

But let us ſee how he proves that Men cannot miſtake the *Senſe* of *Tradition* in *particular Points*: The Force of what he ſaith, is, *That Men were always Men, and Chriſtians were always Chriſtians*, and Mr. *Serjeant* is always Mr. *Serjeant* pretending *Demonſtration*, when there is nothing like it. If Men were always Men, they were always apt to be deceived; and unleſs Chriſtians, by being ſuch are *Infallible*, they are liable to Miſtakes. *But the higheſt means to convey the Senſe of Words are to be found in Tradition.* I am quite of another Opinion; I think it the moſt uncertain way in the World, and the Corruption of the firſt Ages of the World are an evident Proof of it, when there were all poſſible Advantages of *Tradition*, and yet the Principles of *Natu-*

*ral*

*ral Religion* were ſtrangely corrupted, although they were plain, eaſy, few, of the higheſt Importance, and Men lived ſo long to inculcate them into the Minds of their Children. If therefore, notwithſtanding *Tradition*, the World might then degenerate into *Polytheiſm* and *Idolatry*; what Abſurdity is it to ſuppoſe, that notwithſtanding *Tradition*, the Chriſtian Doctrine might be corrupted likewiſe?

But Mr. *Serjeant* alledges not only *Words* but *Actions, to determine the Senſe of them*; *as, that Chriſt is the Son of God, by praying to him; and giving Divine Reverence to Chriſt without ſtinting them, or making them ſcruple, leſt they give too much, or commit Idolatry, by giving that to a Creature, which is due onely to God. And does not this Practice, beyond all Poſſibility of Miſtake, inſinuate into them, that he is equally to be adored with God the Father, or Co-equal to him, and ſo not a Creature, but Very God of Very God?*

I anſwer;

I. Would not the very ſame Reaſoning have made the coming in of *Idolatry* impoſſible? For, that there was but *one true God* was evident from all Acts of *Worſhip*, being given onely to him, as the proper Object of it: How then could Men ſo foully miſtake, as to give proper Divine Worſhip to any Creature, there being an infinite Diſtance between God and his Creatures, which every Child could not but know by a conſtant Tradition from *Adam*.

II. How was it poſſible that *External Acts* of *Worſhip* ſhould ſo infallibly prove *Chriſt to be true God*, if all external Acts of Worſhip be of an *Equivocal Nature*, and receive their Determination from the inward Senſe of the Mind? Did not the *Arians* uſe the ſame *external Acts* of *Worſhip* with others, with Reſpect to Chriſt? Where did they ever ſeparate from the *Chriſtian Aſſemblies*, on the Account of the Worſhip given to Chriſt? If not, how was it poſſible from thence to prove Chriſt not to be a *Creature?* So that this is very far from putting the Point of the *Divinity* of *Chriſt* beyond the *Poſſibility* of *Miſtake*. Eſpecially, when *ſolemn Invocation*, which is one of the moſt natural Parts of *Divine Worſhip*, came to be allowed to meer Creatures. All the Difference that can be aſſigned then, muſt be from Mens *Words* and *Profeſſions*, and not from their *External Actions*.

III. The ſame *Divine Reverence* was given to *Chriſt* in the *Apoſtolical Times*, and the utmoſt Care uſed to inſtruct People in the true Doctrine of Chriſt; and yet then we find that Perſons did err in the Senſe of that Propoſition, That *Chriſt is the Son of God*. For even then, the *Ebionites* and *Cerinthians* underſtood it, not in Reſpect of *Nature* but *Adoption*; and ſo did the *Artemonites* and *Samoſatenians* afterwards. And how can that be proved impoſſible to be done, which we ſhew was actually done? Men did notoriouſly miſtake the *ſenſe* of *Chriſt's being the Son of God*, when it was received by *Tradition*; and yet Mr. *Serjeant* pretends it cannot be miſtaken, if it be ſo received.

Mr. *Serjeant* ſtill urges, That *Faith hath Senſe in it*; *and it is inconſiſtent with the Nature of Mankind not to hold ſome Senſe or other, and with the Nature of Chriſtians, not to inſtruct their Children in that Senſe.* And I think *Words written* have as much *Senſe* in them as *Words ſpoken*, and leſs liable to Miſtakes; there being no ſuch Mixtures of the Infirmities of Men in a *written Rule*, as in *Oral Tradition*. But *Inſtances* are unlucky things to be brought againſt *Demonſtrations*, and ſuch is that of Third Letter, *p.* 14.

of the *Cerinthians* and *Artemonities*, who pleaded *Tradition* for their *Senſe*; and yet they were Men, and pretended to deliver the *true Doctrine* of *Chriſt* to their Diſciples.

I alledged another Inſtance, how the Senſe of *Tradition* might be miſtaken; and that was about a *Real Preſence* in the *Euchariſt*, which might be underſtood in very different Senſes. *No*, ſaith Mr. *Serjeant That cannot be; for, Faith works on our devout Affections, which muſt either oblige us to pay an infinite Veneration to a Creature, if Chriſt's Real Body (and conſequently God) be not there, or if Chriſt be not God, which is the greateſt deviation from true Religion that is poſſible; or elſe to be highly irreverent, and to want the moſt efficacious Motive that can be imagined to excite and elevate our Devotions, if he be there, or Chriſt be indeed God.* Truly Mr. *Serjeant's* way of Writing is the moſt effectual means I know to make me Queſtion whether *written Words be a good way to convey a Certain Senſe* to our Minds. For, I cannot underſtand, how *Faiths working on our devout Affections, ſhould oblige us, either to pay an infinite Veneration to a Creature, or elſe to be highly Irreverent.* For, ſuppoſing I believe *Chriſt's Body* not to be *really* in the *Euchariſt*, but yet that *Chriſt himſelf is God*, I think my ſelf bound to ſhew the utmoſt Reverence to *Chriſt as God*, even in the *Act* of *Receiving the Euchariſt:* And I am of Opinion, that the juſt Apprehenſion of the Divine Majeſty, is as apt to *excite and elevate our Devotion*, as the believing the *Body of Chriſt* to be there really preſent. But it is obſervable, what Mr. *Serjeant* here grants, that if *Chriſt's Body* be not there, they are guilty of *paying an Infinite Veneration to a Creature, which is the greateſt deviation from true Religion that is poſſible.* And upon my Word then they had need have better Aſſurance, than what he offers, to prove *Chriſt's real Body* to be there. For, if as great Reverence may be paid to *Chriſt in Heaven*, as if he were *in the Elements*, I cannot ſee how the Poſture of *Adoration* can any ways determine the *Senſe* of *Tradition* in this Matter.

And thus Mr. *Serjeant* left the *Senſe* of *Tradition* as *uncertain*, as he pretends that of *Scripture* to be; and if his Argument will hold againſt the One being the *Rule* of *Faith*, it will do as great a Kindneſs for the Other alſo. Thus I have fully anſwered his main Argument, againſt Scriptures being a Rule of Faith, which he hath been ſo free with me, as to tell me *I cannot Anſwer*; and he and I muſt now leave it to the Reader's Judgment.

*Firſt Letter, p. 32.*

The ſumm of it is,

I. We diſtinguiſh *Neceſſary Points* of *Faith*, from *Matters* of *Speculation.*

II. We diſtinguiſh *Certainty* of *Faith* in order to *Salvation*, and *Certainty* of *Opinion* in *Matters* of *Controverſie.*

III. We diſtinguiſh the *Certainty* of the *Rule*, from the *Certainty* of the *Application* of that *Rule.*

And then my Anſwer lies in theſe things;

I. That the *Scripture* is a certain *Rule of Faith* as to all *Points neceſſary to Salvation*, to all ſuch as make uſe of it as ſuch, and do not through their own fault make a wrong *Application* thereof.

II. That the *Scripture* was not deſigned for a *Certain Rule* as to *Unneceſſary Opinions*; and therefore Mens not arriving at a *Certainty* in them, doth not hinder its being a *Rule of Faith.*

III. The *Scripture* being our *Rule of Faith*, we are bound to reject all pretended *Articles* of *Faith*, which cannot with *Certainty* be proved from

from the *Senſe* of *Scripture*. And ſo the Proof of *Certainty* lies upon thoſe who affirm ſuch *Articles* of *Faith*, and not upon us who deny them.

This Argument is Mr. *Serjeant*'s *Goliah*, and now it is no wonder if his leſſer *Men at Arms* ſoon quit the Field. But I muſt take ſome notice of them, leſt they be magnified, by being ſlighted.

His next Argument is, *That I contradict my ſelf*: I hope I have in the beginning made him unwilling to repeat ſuch a Charge againſt me, till he hath cleared himſelf. But wherein is it? In another place, he ſaith, *I deny any Abſolute Certainty as to Tradition atteſting the Books of Scripture*; *which in the Conference I aſſerted.* I have looked in the Place he refers to, and there I find nothing like it. I deny the Neceſſity of any Infallible Society of Men, either to Atteſt or Explain the Scripture. Where, by an *Infallible Society* of Men, I mean ſuch as have a *Divine Aſſiſtance* to that purpoſe: And what is this to the *Abſolute Certainty* we have of the *Books* of *Scripture* by *Univerſal Tradition?* But he urges it further, *If this Society be not Infallible, then it is Fallible*; *and if it be Fallible, then we cannot be more than fallibly Certain, and ſo we can have no abſolute Certainty from a Fallible Teſtimony.* This is the whole force of what he ſaith. To which I Anſwer.

I. I underſtand no ſuch thing as *Infallibility* in Mankind, but by *immediate Divine Aſſiſtance.* I grant, that the Holy Spirit may, where he pleaſes, preſerve the Minds of Men from any poſſibility of miſtake, as to thoſe things, wherein it doth inlighten them; but ſet aſide this, there is no ſuch thing as *Infallibility*; the utmoſt is a *rational Certainty* built on clear and convincing Motives. Where the *Motives* are meerly *probable*, there may be *Opinion*, but on *Certainty*; where the Evidence is thought ſo ſtrong as to determine Aſſent, there is a *Certainty* as to the Mind; as when we commonly ſay, we are *certain* of ſuch things, we mean no more, than that we firmly believe them; but when the Evidence is the higheſt, which in point of Reaſon the thing is capable of, then there is that which I call *Abſolute Certainty*; *i. e.* ſuch as depends not meerly on the *Aſſent* of the Mind, but the *Evidence* which juſtifies that Aſſent.

II. If by being *fallibly Certain*, he means any *Suſpicion*, that notwithſtanding ſuch Evidence in all its Circumſtances, *I may be deceived*, then I utterly deny it; for otherwiſe I could not be *abſolutely Certain*; but if he means only, that there is no *Divine Infallibility* (and I know no other) then I own that there is ſtill *humane Fallibility* conſiſtent with this *Abſolute Certainty.* But Mr. *Serjeant* will have *Abſolute Certainty to be Infallible:* If nothing will ſatisfie him, but *Humane* (*i. e.* fallible) *Infallibility*, much good may it do him; but I much rather chuſe proper Terms, which I know the certain meaning of, than improper, though they make a far greater Noiſe. I do own an *Abſolute Certainty* in ſome Acts of the Mind by *inward Perception*, as that *I think*, *I doubt*, and *that I am*; I do own an *Abſolute Certainty* as to common *Objects* of *Senſe*; and as to ſome Deductions of Reaſon; I do own an *Abſolute Certainty* as to ſome *Matters* of *Fact*, by a Concurrence of Circumſtances; but for all that, I do not account Humane Nature *Infallible*, nor this an *Infallible Certainty*, unleſs it be taken in another Senſe than *Divines* take it in. For even the *Divines* of the Church of *Rome*, as well as Ours, make a dif-

ference between a *Humane* and *Acquiſite Certainty*, and that which is *Divine* and *Infallible*. And if Mr. *Serjeant* by *Divine* means *Humane*, and by *Infallible* no more than *Certain*, he muſt not think he hath gained any great matter, when he hath made uſe of *Words* in an improper and unuſual Senſe.

*Firſt Letter*, P. 25

III. His next Argument is, That *our Rule of Faith is common to all the Hereſies in the World, which pretend Scripture, as well as we.* This is juſt the Old *Sceptical* Argument againſt *Certainty*; if there be any ſuch a thing as *Certainty*, you muſt aſſign ſuch a *Criterion which is not common to Truth and Falſhood*; but if you cannot aſſign any ſuch Mark of Truth, which may not as well agree to what is Falſe, then there is no ſuch thing as *Certainty* to be had. In matters of this nature, the Proof muſt not lie in *Generals*, but we muſt come to *Particulars*, to ſhew the *Grounds* of our *Certainty*, viz. *as to the Trinity, and Incarnation of Chriſt*, and then if we cannot ſhew why we believe thoſe Points, and reject the oppoſite Hereſies, as *Arianiſm*, *Sabellianiſm*, *Eutychianiſm*, &c. then we are to be blamed for want of *Certainty* in theſe Points, but not before. *But this*, he ſaith, *is to make Light and Darkneſs very conſiſtent, and Chriſt and Belial very good Friends.* It ſeems then, there is no difference to be found, *by the Rule* of *Scripture*, between the *Doctrine of Chriſt* and the *Devil*. Is this in Truth your avowed Principle? Do you in earneſt believe the Scripture to be ſuch a *Chaos*, where there is no difference of *Light* and *Darkneſs*, and that nothing but *Confuſion* can be found in it; And we cannot tell by it, whether we are *to Worſhip God or the Devil?* If Mr. *Serjeant* grants, that there is enough in Scripture to diſtinguiſh theſe two; then it is a *Rule*, ſo far, as to put a difference between *Light and Darkneſs*, between *Chriſt and Belial*; and ſo theſe Expreſſions muſt be diſowned as little leſs then *Blaſphemous*, for all his pitiful Defence of them in his *Second Letter*; which is, *That he never ſaid that Chriſt and Belial could be reconciled, or advanced any Poſition that implied it.* But he ſaid, *That to make Scripture our Rule, is to make Light and Darkneſs conſiſtent, and Chriſt and Belial very good Friends.* And is not this *Blaſphemy* againſt *Scripture*? and implies, that if we go by that *Rule* only, *they may be very good Friends.* How can this be, unleſs he aſſerts that by Scripture alone, we can find no certain difference *between Light and Darkneſs, between Chriſt and Belial?* Let Mr. *Serjeant* Anſwer to this, and not think to eſcape with ſuch a poor Evaſion. If he owns the *Scripture* a *Certain Rule* as to the difference of *Chriſt and Belial, and Light and Darkneſs*, then we have gained thus much, that in ſome Matters of very great Moment, the *Scripture* is a very *ſufficient Rule and Ground of Certainty*, as to all Points between Us and Infidels. And if it be ſo, as to theſe Points, then why not as well as to other Points conſequent upon theſe? *If Chriſt be the Eternal Son of God* in oppoſition to *Heathen Deities*, and we can know him by *Scripture* to be ſo, then we may as well know him to be the *Eternal Son of God* in oppoſition to *Arians* and *Socinians*. If againſt the *Heathens* we can prove from *Scripture*, that *the Word was made Fleſh*, Why will not this as well hold againſt *Neſtorians* and *Eutychians*? And ſo the *Scripture* becomes a very *ſuffiient Rule* to diſtinguiſh *Light* and *Darkneſs* in ſuch Points among *Chriſtians* too. For, is it ever the leſs fit to be a *Rule*, becauſe both Parties own it? *But they differ about the Senſe of it, and therefore Controverſies can never be ended by it.* If Church-Hiſtory deceive us not, the greateſt

greateſt Controverſies were ended by it, before General Councils were heard of, and more than have been ſince. Many of thoſe we read of in the firſt Ages were quite laid aſleep, as *Theodoret* obſerves; but ſince *Church-Authority* interpoſed in the moſt reaſonable manner, ſome Differences have been perpetuated, as appears by the *Neſtorian* and *Eutychian* Controverſies. I do not blame the *Authority* of *Councils*, proceeding as they then did by the Rule of Scriptures, but the Event ſhewed, that moſt probable Means are ſometimes very ineffectual for *ending Controverſies*. And thoſe which Men think will moſt effectually ſuppreſs *Hereſies*, do often give a new Life and Spirit to them; ſo vain are the Imaginations of Men about putting an *End to Controverſies*, till they come to a *Certainty* about the *true Senſe of Scripture*. It is poſſible to ſtop Mens Mouths by Force and Power, but nothing brings Men to a true Satisfaction, but inward Conviction as to the *true Senſe of Scripture*; and there can be no rational *Certainty* as to theſe Points without it. If Controverſies be not ended, let us not blame the *Wiſdom* of *Providence*; for God doth not always appoint the Means moſt effectual in our Judgment, but ſuch as are moſt ſuitable to his own Deſign. And we ſee Reaſon enough to blame the Folly and Weakneſs, the Prejudice and Partiality, the Wilfulneſs and Obſtinacy of Mankind, till humane Nature be brought to a better Temper, we may deſpair of ſeeing any *End of Controverſies*. Men may diſpute, and for all that I know, will do to the World's End, about the Method to put an End to Diſpute. For the Controverſies about *Certainty* and *Fatality* have been always the Matters of Debate among diſputing Men, under ſeveral Names and *Hypotheſes*, and are like ſo to be to the general Conflagration.

*Theod. Hæret. Fab. l. 2, 3.*

IV. He ſaith, *Scripture is not our diſtinguiſhing Rule of Faith, but our own particular Judgments about Scripture; for that which diſtinguiſhes my Rule from that of the moſt abominable Hereſies, can only be my own Judgment upon the Letter of Scripture, and wriggle which way I will, there it will and muſt end at laſt.* I wiſh Mr. *Serjeant* had been a little better converſant in the old Diſputes about *Certainty*; for it would have ſaved me the trouble of anſwering ſome impertinent Objections; ſuch as this before us. For they would have been thought mean Logicians, who could not put a difference between the *Rule of Judgment*, and the *Judgment* which a Man made according to the Rule. Suppoſe the Queſtion were about *Senſe*, whether that were a *certain Rule* or not to judge by; and *Epicurus* ſhould affirm it, and ſay he ſo firmly believed it, that he judged the Sun to be bigger than he ſeemed to his Senſes, would not he have been thought ridiculous, who ſhould have ſaid this Fancy of *Epicurus* was his *Rule*? The *Rule* he went by was in it ſelf certain, but he made a wrong Judgment upon it; but that was not his Rule. So it is here: We declare the *Scripture* to be our only certain and ſtanding *Rule*, whereby we are to judge in Matters of Faith; and we underſtand it as well as we can, and form our Judgments by it; but doth it hence follow, that our *Judgment* is our *Rule*? We may be deceived in our Judgments, but our Rule is *Infallible*; we may differ in our *Judgments*, but our *Rule* is one and the ſame. And how is it poſſible for thoſe who differ in *Judgment* to have the *ſame Rule*, if our *Rule* and our *Judgment* be the ſame? For then their *Rules* muſt be as different as their Judgments. I know not what modern *Logick* Mr. *Serjeant* learnt; but I am ſure he learnt not this

*First Letter, p. 26.*

way of *Reasoning* from the ancient *Philosophers*, who discoursed about the *Criterion* after another manner than our great Pretender to *Logick* doth.

*First Letter*, p. 26. V. He objects, *That our People do not make Scripture the Rule of their Faith, not one in a Million relying upon it; and therefore this Pretence of mine*, he saith, *looks like a meer Jest; and he cannot perswade himself that I am earnest, while I advance such a Paradox.* What doth *J. Serjeant* mean, to call one of the Articles of our Church *a Jest* and *a Paradox*? For the Words of our Sixth *Article*, are, **Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to Salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any Man, that it should be believed as an Article of Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to Salvation.**

Doth *J. Serjeant* now take this for a *Paradox* among us? I assure him I love not to make *Jests* about *Scripture*, nor *Matters of Faith* and *Salvation*. But wherein doth this *Jest* lie? *Why*, forsooth, *I make the People to make the Scripture their Rule, and not one in a Million thinks of relying on it.* Have they then any other *Rule* of *Faith*, which they *rely upon*? What is it, I pray? Is it the *Church's Infallibility*? Page 27. No. Is it *Pius* the Fourth's Creed? No truly, *while they are Children they believe Tradition.* Now, I think, *J. Serjeant* hath hit it. *Tradition* is indeed a *Rule of Faith* for *Children*; who are very apt *simply to believe their Fathers and Teachers.* But suppose *they come to Years of Discretion*, what Rule of Faith have they then? Have they a *Judgment of Discretion* then? *No*; *this is another Jest.* For he supposes all our People to be a dull sort of *Animals*, that understand nothing of *Scripture* or *Faith* themselves, (I wonder then that they make no more Converts among them) but trust their Parson for all; for, *Boves arabant & Asinæ pascebantur juxta eos*, therefore the People have no *Judg-* 2.2.q.4.a.6. *ment of Discretion*: I hope *J. Serjeant* knows whose *Jest* or rather *Argument* that was. Whatever he insinuates as to our People, I have Reason to believe far better of them; and that all those who mind their Salvation, do seriously read and consider the *Holy Scriptures* as the *Rule* of their *Faith*. But if in *Matters* of *Opinion*, or in doubtful or obscure Places, they make use of the Skill and Assistance of their Teachers, wherein are they to blame? The *Scripture* is still their *Rule*, but the Help of their Teachers is for the better understanding it. And cannot our Logician distinguish between the *Rule of Faith*, and the *Helps* to *understand* it? Suppose now a Mother or a Nurse should quit Page 28. *honest Tradition*, as *J. Serjeant* here calls it; and be so ill inclined, as to teach Children to spell, and to *read in the New Testament*, and by that means they come by degrees to understand the Doctrine which Christ preached, and the Miracles which he wrought, and from thence to believe in Christ, and to obey his Commands, I desire to know into what these Persons do resolve their Faith. Is it indeed into those who taught them to read? Or into the *New Testament*, as the *Ground* of their Faith? When they have been all along told, that the Scripture alone is the Word of God; and whatever they are to believe, it is because it is contained therein. And so, by whatever means they come to understand the Scripture, it is that alone they take for the *Rule* and *Foundation* of their *Faith*. If a Man were resolved to observe *Hippocrates* his Rules, but finds himself uncapable of understanding him, and therefore desires a *Physician*'s Help; I would fain know

know, whether he relies upon the Skill of his Interpreter, or the Authority of *Hippocrates?* It is poſſible his Interpreter may, in ſome doubtful and obſcure Places, have miſtaken *Hippocrates* his Meaning; but however, the *Reaſon* of his keeping to the *Rules* is not upon the Account of the *Interpreter*, but of *Hippocrates*. *But ſuppoſe a College of Phyſicians interpret* Hippocrates *otherwiſe, is he bound then to believe his own Interpreter againſt the Senſe of the College?* I anſwer: If a College of *Phyſicians* ſhould tranſlate *Bread* for *Cheeſe*; or by *Phlebotomy* ſhould declare was meant cutting of *Arteries*, or of a Man's Throat, let them preſume to be never ſo *Infallible*, I would truſt any ſingle Interpreter, with the Help of *Lexicons* and *Common Senſe*, againſt them all; but eſpecially, if I can produce *Galen* and the old *Phyſicians*, who underſtood *Hippocrates* beſt, on my ſide. This is our Caſe, as to the People, about *diſputable Points*; we do not ſet up our own *Authority* againſt a *Church* pretending to be *Infallible*, we never require them to truſt wholly to our Judgments; but we give them our beſt Aſſiſtance, and call in the *old Interpreters* of the *Church*, and we deſire them to uſe their own Reaſon and Judgment, with Divine Aſſiſtance, for ſettling their Minds.

If People be negligent and careleſs, and will not take neceſſary Pains to inform themſelves, which Mr *Serjeant* ſuggeſts, we are not bound to give an Account of thoſe who do not obſerve our Directions. And I never yet knew the Negligent and Careleſs brought into a Diſpute of Religion; for in this Caſe, we muſt ſuppoſe People to act according to the Principles of the Religion they own, otherwiſe their Examples ſignify no more againſt our Doctrine, than *Debauchery* doth againſt the Rules of *Hippocrates*.

*But ſuppoſe*, ſaith Mr. *Serjeant*, *that one of my own Flock ſhould tell me, that I have erred in interpreting Scripture, he deſires to know what I would ſay to him?* This is a very eaſy Queſtion, and ſoon anſwer'd. I would endeavour to convince him as well as I could. *And is that all?* And what would *J. Serjeant* do more? Would he tell him he was Infallible? I think not; but only as *honeſt Tradition* makes him ſo, and how far that goes towards it, I ſhall examine afterwards. Page 295

Well; but ſuppoſe *John Biddle, againſt the Miniſter of his Pariſh, and the whole Church of* England *to boot, underſtands Scripture to be plainly againſt a Trinity and Chriſt's Divinity.*

And it is but fair for me to ſuppoſe him, maintaining his Hereſy againſt *J. Serjeant*; and let any one judge whether of us be more likely to convince him. He owns the Scripture, and confeſſes if we can prove our Doctrine from thence, he will yield; but he laughs at Oral Tradition, and thinks it a *Jeſt* for any one to prove ſuch a Doctrine by it. And truly, if it were not for the Proofs from Scripture, I do much queſtion, whether any Argument from meer Tradition could ever confute ſuch a one as *John Biddle*. But when we offer ſuch Proofs, as are acknowledged to be ſufficient in themſelves, we take the only proper way to give him reaſonable Satisfaction. *Suppoſe he will not be convinced.* Who can help that? Chriſt himſelf met with wilful and obſtinate Unbelievers. And was this any Diſparagement to his Doctrine? God himſelf hath never promiſed to cure thoſe who ſhut their Eyes againſt the Light.

*Shall*

Page 29. *Shall the Believing Church then have the Liberty to interpret Scripture againſt the Teaching Church?* Who ever aſſerted any ſuch thing? We onely ſay, that the People are to underſtand the Grounds of their Faith; and to judge by the beſt Helps they can, what Doctrine is agreeable to Scripture, and to embrace what is ſo, and to reject what is not: But among thoſe Helps we take in, not barely the perſonal Aſſiſtance of their own Guide, but the Evidence he brings, as to the Senſe of the Teaching Church, in the beſt and pureſt Ages.

Page 29. It is very ſtrange, that after this, it ſhould preſently follow, *'Tis evident hence, that Tradition of our Fathers and Teachers, and not Scriptures Letter, is indeed our Rule; and by it we interpret Scripture.* If this be ſo *evident*, then how is it poſſible, we ſhould ſet up the *Eccleſia Credens* againſt the *Eccleſia Docens*; as he charged us juſt before. If *Tradition* be our Rule, and we interpret Scripture by it, what fault then are we guilty of, if Tradition be ſuch an Infallible Rule? But, methinks, this *Hence* looks a little *Illogically* upon the Premiſes; and if this be his *Concluſive Evidence*, he muſt excuſe me as to the making it a Ground of my Faith.

But he allows, *That we ſet up Scripture as our Rule, when we Diſpute againſt them; but when that is done, we ſet up our own Authority over the People, and do not allow them that Privilege againſt us, which we take againſt the Church of* Rome. This is all the ſtrength of what I can make out of that Paragraph. For if all Writing were like his, it would be the beſt Argument for Oral Tradition; his Senſe is ſo intricate, and his Concluſions ſo remote from his Premiſes. Juſt before he ſaid, *'Tis evident hence that we follow Tradition.* And preſently, *'Tis as evident we do not follow it, and ſet up our Authority againſt it. We do interpret Scripture by Tradition*; and yet immediately, *we ſet up Scripture againſt Tradition. We plead for the Peoples Right to a Judgment of Diſcretion*; and yet *we do not allow them a Judgment of Diſcretion.* What inviſible links hath Oral Tradition to connect things, that ſeem ſo far aſunder?

But however it be expreſſed or connected, his meaing is, *That we onely ſet up Scripture againſt the Church of* Rome, *and then ſet up our own Authority over the People.* This is not poſſible, if we do allow them a *Judgment* of *Diſcretion*; and this is one of the things he ſo much charges upon me; and ſaith, *He never read any Proteſtant that puts Matters more into private hands than I do*; and yet in the very next Page, he ſaith, *I deny the People the ſame Privilege againſt Paſtoral Authority.* How can I deny them ſuch a Privilege, if I put Matters into their hands above any other Proteſtant? I do not know, that I do in the leaſt differ from the ſixth Article of our Church; nor do I take off from the due Authority of Biſhops and Paſtors of Churches. But all our Diſpute is, about this *Judgment* of *Diſcretion*, whether it be allowable to People, and how far.

Page 29.

Third Letter, *p.* 92. In his *Third Letter* he reſumes this Argument, and thither I follow him, that I may lay things together into ſome Method. The words he cavils at, are, "If we have the Conſent of all Chriſtian Churches "againſt the only pretended Infallible Judge, we have their Conſent "likewiſe, that every Man is to judge for his own Salvation. What hurt is there in this? *It ſeems then nothing will content us now but Infallibility.* Was there ever ſuch an awkard Man at Reaſoning? It follows indeed, that either there muſt be an Infallible Judge, or every Man muſt judge for himſelf. *Do I then allow no Authority to Church-Governors,*

*that*

*that do not pretend to Infallibility?* Yes, very much, while they do not pretend to Impoſe on our Faith, by a pretence to Infallibility. But what Occaſion do I give for this, when I ſay only, *That every Man muſt judge for his own Salvation*; and yet he had the Conſcience to leave this out in repeating my Senſe, but two lines after. May not you miſtake or pervert to Day, what you heard Yeſterday, when I find you miſtaking or perverting my Senſe, but at two lines diſtance? And then run on in a long Diſcourſe, as though you had taken the true Senſe of my Words. Is not this a fit Perſon *to play out Mr.* Godden's *Game*, who *ſhuffles* in ſo ſtrange a manner, and ſo openly *plays falſe Cards?* Where did I ever diſpute againſt Church-Authority in due propoſing Matters of Faith, provided that every Man is to judge for his own Salvation? *But I have*, he ſaith, *an aking Tooth at the Churches intermeddling in Matters of Faith.* From whence doth this appear? This muſt either ariſe from great Ignorance, as to the Right of Judging every Man hath as to his own Salvation; or from a Malicious Deſign, to expoſe me to all Church-Governors; but I pity his Ignorance, and deſpiſe his Malice. What pleaſant Entertainment doth he make with the *Sober Enquirer? 'Tis pity* (ſaith he) *but he had a blue Apron on, and a Tub to Hold-forth in*; as a *Sober Enquirer* may poſſibly find ſome Pretenders to *Infallibility* have done in their Time. But what is the meaning of all this ado about a *Sober Enquirer?* I had ſaid many years ago, "That the Scri- "ptures being owned, as containing in them the whole Will of God "ſo plainly revealed, that no Sober Enquirer can miſs of what is ne- "ceſſary for Salvation, there can be no Neceſſity ſuppoſed of an In- "fallible Society of Men either to Atteſt or Explain theſe Writings "among Chriſtians, any more than there was for ſome Ages before "Chriſt, of ſuch a Body of Men among the Jews, to Atteſt or Explain "to them the Writings of *Moſes* and the Prophets. And where lies the Hereſie or Danger of this Doctrine? If I ſaid that no Sober Enquirer can miſs of things neceſſary to Salvation in Scripture, it is no more than St. *Chryſoſtom*, St. *Auguſtin*, *Aquinas*, and other School-men, had ſaid before me; and *Were they for blue Aprons and Tubs to Hold forth in?* Nay, to ſhew how unskilful *J. Serjeant* is in the Writers of his own Church, (if they do own him) even *Ballarmine* himſelf grants as much as I ſay. For being to Anſwer that Place *Jam.* 1. 5. *If any Man lack Wiſdom, let him ask it of God, who giveth liberally*, &c. he Anſwers, This is to be underſtood of *Sapientia neceſſaria ad Salutem*; ſo then a Sober Enquirer praying to God to give him Wiſdom, ſhall not want that which is Neceſſary to his Salvation. And he quotes ſeveral Paſſages of St. *Auguſtin* to prove, *that Prayer obtains nothing Infallibly but that which is neceſſary or uſeful to the Salvation of him that prays.* If this be then obtained Infallibly, then we ſee an Infallible Ground of Certainty, as to what is Neceſſary or Uſeful to Salvation. *Bellarmine* indeed ſaith, that a Gift of Interpretation is not to be had by Prayer; and, Do I ever ſay it is? Did I ever give the leaſt Countenance to Enthuſiaſtick Pretenders, or to the Breakers of the Laws and Orders of our Eſtabliſhed Church? What means then theſe ſpiteful Inſinuations? Doth the Man hope to raiſe Himſelf by expoſing Me? Or to be careſſed by *F. P.* and *F. W.* for the brave attempt of throwing Dirt ſo plainly in my Face? Which will never ſtick, being ſo unskilfully thrown, either to my Prejudice, or his Advantage.

Page 93.

*Bell. de verbo Dei*, l. 3. c. 6. ſect. *Reſpondeo.*

But

But this Matter about the Peoples Judgment of Diſcretion, muſt not be thus paſs'd over: For he reſumes it at the end of his *Third Letter*, and thought it a good reliſhing Bit to conclude with. And towards the very end he begins to ſtate the Controverſy, this true Logician having forgotten it before, or reſerved it for a Deſert at the laſt.

Third Letter, *p.* 99. *To come cloſer* (ſaith he) *and take a more diſtinct View of this Judgment of Diſcretion.* It was even time to come cloſer in the 99th *Page* of the *Third Letter*. Alas for Mr. *Godden!* he is like to have a hopeful Game of it, when his Subſtitute talks at this rate at the very end of the Game. But let us ſee what Feats he will do now he *comes cloſer. Now he will acquaint me how far he allows it, and how far, and how in what he rejects it.* This is well, but why no ſooner? He was at another Game before, *viz.* two or three Throws at the *ſober Enquirer*, and having knock'd him down with his *blue Apron* and *Tub*, he now comes to *T. Godden*'s *Cards* again. And let us ſee how well he plays them. Firſt, he grants, *That every Man is to judge for his own Salvation*, i. e. he yields what the *ſober Enquirer* aim'd at; and now methinks he deſires *the blue Apron and Tub, to hold forth* himſelf. Secondly, he ſaith, *All Mankind are agreed in it.* It ſeems then the *Fanaticks* are *true Catholicks* in Mr. *Serjeant*'s Opinion. Thirdly, he yields, *That every Man is to judge of the beſt way to Salvation, and of all the Controverſies between them and us.* Now the *Tub* is turn'd to a *Chair*, and the *Holder-forth* become a *Judge of Controverſies.* Nay, he goes ſo far as to ſay, *the contrary Tenet is ridiculous, as what's moſt*; nay, that it is *Sottiſhneſs to hold it*; *and to deprive Mankind of this Privilege of judging thus, is to debar him of the Light and Uſe of his Reaſon, when it is moſt uſeful for him.* Is not all this very obliging? But where now lies the Difference? *Why*, truly, *if his Diſcretion leads him to the Infallible Rule of Tradition, all is well*; *but if not, it is no longer Diſcretion.* What! has he been Judge of all the Controverſies between us already, and is he to ſeek for his *Rule* ſtill? What *Diſcretion* had he all that time to judge without a Rule? What a *Judge* of *Controverſies* have we found at laſt? Methinks the *ſober Enquirer* far exceeds him in point of common *Diſcretion*; for he never pretended to judge without a Rule, much leſs all the Controverſies between us. But this diſcreet Judge of all Controverſies, firſt determines all the Points; and when he hath done this, he finds out his Rule. Of all the Judges of Controverſies that have been yet talked of, commend me to this ſet up by *J. Serjeant*: For how is it poſſible for him to judge amiſs, who had no Rule to judge by?

Page 102. *You ſee* (ſaith he) *how we allow them the Uſe of their Reaſon and Judgment of Diſcretion, till it brings them to find a certain Authority, and when they have once found that, the ſame Judgment of Diſcretion which ſhewed them that Authority was abſolutely certain, obliges them to truſt it, when it tells them what is Chriſt's Faith, without uſing their private Judgments any longer about the particular Points themſelves thus aſcertain'd to them, but ſubmitting to it.* To which I anſwer,

I. The ſame Reaſon which enabled Men to find out this *Infallible Guide* or *certain Authority*, will help them to judge concerning this Authority, and the Matters propoſed by it. For either he hath a Rule to find out this *Authority*, or he hath none; if he hath a Rule, it muſt be

be either Scripture or pure Natural Reaſon. If Scripture, that only affords *fallible Certainty*, he ſaith over and over, and ſo a Man can never come certainly to this Authority. And if the Foundation be uncertain, what can the Rule do? But Mr. *Serjeant* doth not pretend *Scripture* but *Reaſon* for his Infallible Rule. Then I demand, whether Reaſon doth afford an Infallible Ground of Certainty, as to this certain Authority or not? If it doth, we are yet but *fallibly certain*; if it doth not, then what need this certain Authority; for in the Opinion of all reaſonable Men, *certain Reaſon* is better than *certain Authority*. And he cannot deny the Certainty of Reaſon, who builds the Certainty of Authority upon it.

II. Suppoſe the particular Points propoſed by this certain Authority be repugnant to that Certainty of Reaſon, by which I am required to believe it: As ſuppoſe this Authority tells me, I am no longer to rely upon my Reaſon, but barely to ſubmit it, although the Matter propoſed be never ſo much againſt it: What is to be done in this Caſe? I am to believe this certain Authority on the Account of Reaſon, and that requires me to believe ſuch things as overthrow the Certainty of Reaſon; how is it poſſible for me to rely on this certain Authority on the Certainty of Reaſon, when that Authority tells me, there is no Certainty in Reaſon?

III. Muſt I believe *Reaſon* to be *certain* juſt ſo far and no further? But who ſets the Bounds? Hath God Almighty done it? When and where? I may and ought to uſe my Reaſon in ſearching after this certain Authority, and to judge all Controverſies in order to the finding it out; all this is allowed: But as ſoon as ever this certain Authority is diſcover'd, then *Good-night Reaſon*, I have now no more Uſe for you. But who bid you be ſo ungrateful to that certain Reaſon, which conducted you ſo far? It is very poſſible it may be as uſeful ſtill, why then do you turn Reaſon off ſo unkindly after ſo good Service?

IV. Are all People capable of this certain Reaſon, or not? It requires, it ſeems, a great deal of Logick to prove this certain Authority, or this Infallible Guide by Reaſon; and I am one of thoſe that think it can never be done. Suppoſe then ſome of us duller People can never comprehend the Force of this Reaſon, which is to lead us to an Infallible Guide, what is like to become of us uncapable People? Are we all to be damned for Dunces and Blockheads? No, not ſo neither: This is really ſome Comfort. For then it is to be hoped we may go to Heaven without finding out this *certain Authority*; and then we may have true Faith without it: This is ſtill better and better. And then I pray what need have I to find out this certain Authority at all, if I may have true Faith, and be ſaved without it?

V. I have greater Certainty by *Reaſon* of the *certain Authority* of *Scripture*, than you can have of the *certain Authority* of *Tradition*. Here is *Reaſon* on both ſides, and *Authority* on both ſides; but I ſay there is no Compariſon between either the *Reaſon* or the *Authority*. The *Reaſon* to believe the *Scripture* is ſo incomparably beyond the Reaſon to believe *Oral Tradition*; and the Authority of *Scripture* hath ſo much

greater Force on the Conſciences of Men, that it is very extraordinary among thoſe who own the Scripture to be the Word of God, to find them compared in Point of *Authority*: For we muſt deal plainly in this Matter; the Scripture we look on as the *Rule* of our *Faith*, becauſe it is the *Word of God*. If you do not own it to be ſo, but reſolve all into *Tradition*, we know what you are; but if you do own the *Scripture* to be of *Divine Revelation*, how can you pretend to ſet up any *certain Authority* in compariſon with it?

VI. If this *certain Authority* be only to lead us into the *certain Senſe* of Scripture, then it muſt be either into the *Senſe* of plain Places, or of difficult and obſcure: If of plain Places, then it is to kindle a Torch to behold the Sun; if of obſcure Places, then who hath appointed this certain Authority to explain them? Who is to appoint ſuch a certain Authority in the Church to explain his Word, but God himſelf? And we deſire to ſee ſome plain Places, that ſet up this Authority to explain thoſe which are obſcure and doubtful. We think it our Duty to read and *ſearch the Scripture*, and eſpecially the *New Teſtament*, where we find very great Occaſion for this certain Authority to be mentioned. We find Churches newly ſettled, and many Diſputes and Controverſies ſtarted among them, and thoſe of great and dangerous Conſequence; we find the Apoſtles giving frequent Advice to theſe Churches with reſpect to theſe Differences, and with great Earneſtneſs giving Caution againſt Seducers, and warning them of the Danger of them; but not one Word can we find in all their Epiſtles tending this way, or mentioning any *certain Authority* they were to ſubmit to, for the putting an End to all Controverſies. This is really a Matter of ſo much Concernment to the whole Chriſtian World, that if any ſuch thing had been in the Deſign of Chriſtianity, I can never believe that the Apoſtles would have omitted it in their ſeveral Epiſtles. Had not they ſufficient Care of the *Certainty* of Mens Minds, and of the Peace of the Church? Was it a *Secret* concealed then from them? Or not thought fit to be communicated by them, when it was moſt neceſſary to prevent the early Corruptions and Errors of the Chriſtian Churches? But they are ſo far from it, that I cannot find any Intimation to that Purpoſe in all their Writings, altho' they had the faireſt Occaſions for it.

VII. If Men by *certain Reaſon* have found out this *certain Authority*, what are they to do with this *certain Reaſon* afterwards? Methinks it is a little hard for ever to diſcharge ſo uſeful a Servant immediately after ſo extraordinary a Piece of Service, as the finding out an *Infallible Guide*. We do not find the Apoſtles directing the People not to make uſe of their Underſtandings, becauſe their Guides were Infallible. I am apt to think the Apoſtles were as *Infallible* as *Tradition* or *Church-Authority* ever ſince; and therefore what Allowance was made by them to a *Judgment* of *Diſcretion* is ſtill to continue. What doth St. *Paul* mean to ſpeak to the *Corinthians* in ſuch a manner, *I ſpeak as to wiſe Men, judge ye what I ſay.* How different is this from *I ſpeak by an Infallible Spirit, and ye are not to judge what I ſay?* When he ſaith to the *Theſſalonians*, *Prove all things*, doth he mean, *Swallow all things, and prove nothing?* When St. *John* ſaith, *Try the Spirits, whether they are of God*, doth he only mean, till they had found a certain Au-

1 Cor. 10. 15.

1 Theſſ. 5. 21.

John 4. 1.

thority

thority? Did not they believe St. *John*'s Authority to be Certain? If not, to what purpose did he write his Epistle to them? If he did, he supposed them still to have a liberty of Judging, even those who pretend to Inspiration. *For, many false Prophets are gone out into the world.* And there are certain Rules and Marks to judge of the Pretences to an Infallible Spirit, which were in vain assigned, if they were not to judge by them.

VIII. Suppose Men differ about this *Certain Authority*, wherein it lies, and how far it extends; Are not they to exercise their *Reason* still about this? Suppose some pretend, that it lies in an *Infallible Assistance* which Christ hath promised to his Church in all Ages; and Others say, this is impossible to be a Ground of Faith, because it is itself an Article of Faith: Must not a Man exercise his Reason about this? Here is *Certain Authority* pleaded; but Others say, there is *Certain Reason* against this Pretence of *Certain Authority*; and they must grant I must follow *Certain Reason*, though against *Certain Authority*. Again, Others say, the *Certain Authority* of *Oral Tradition* is a Novel, vain and dangerous Opinion, *destructive of Faith*, and leading to *Heresie* and *Atheism*; What is to be done in this Case? Must our Reason be quitted, and Men not be allowed to judge of this *Authority* by it? Yes, *till they come to own it, and then they are to judge no longer*; *i. e.* put out your Eyes once, and ye need never think of opening them after. Be very circumspect in the Choice of your Way, till you come to a *Precipice*, and when you are come there, be sure to throw your self from it headlong, and there is an *End* of *Controversies*. But we do not judge this a very Reasonable Method; but think he had much better keep upon plain Ground, and use the best Method he can to find the true Way; and if his Judgment, will serve him to find the *Way* to a *Precipice*, we think it will much better serve him to keep him from it; And that he had better bear with some imperfection of his Sight, than put out his Eyes that he may be the more quietly led, he knows not whither.

There is onely one thing more, which deserves to be taken notice of, about this Argument, *viz.* that *J. Serjeant* saith, *I expresly exclude the Churches Help*; which is, as he triumphantly concludes his Third Letter, *The First Principle, nay the Quintessence of all Heresie, Fanaticism in the Egg, perfect Enthusiasm when hatcht, and downright Atheism when fledg'd.* *Third Leter Page, 104.*

This is a parting Blow indeed. It is the bite of an Angry Viper, at its last Gasp, when it puts its utmost force into the Venom, and hopes even dying to destroy. Others love to conclude gently, but *J. Serjeant* is a Man by himself, and as though he were writing Epigrams, would reserve his Sting for the last. But what Ground is there for all this venemous Froth? Even just as much as there was for the Author of *Pax vobis* to say, *that I am for introducing Paganism*; or for another to make me *the Founder of Anti-Catholick, and Anti-Christian Doctrines*; whereas I profess to own no other than what have been received in this Church ever since the Reformation. But some Mens *Spleen* and *Gall* must have a Vent lest it destroy them. It is some satisfaction to me to think that none but such, who either *Oppose* or *Betray* our Church, set themselves thus to defame me; and it is a great comfort to find such feeble Reasoning, where so much Spite and Malice is discover'd. Thus it is here, with *J. Serjeant* he could merit nothing without giving me hard

words, and becauſe many look on the Beginning and End of a Book, who mind nothing elſe in it; therefore he hath here put together as the Conſequence of my Doctrine, no leſs than *Hereſie*, *Fanaticiſm*, *Enthuſiaſm*, *and downright Atheiſm*. He thought he could not make my Caſe Equal with his own, unleſs I were charged with *Hereſie*, and *Principles leading to Atheiſm*. But he is charged by the moſt *Zealous Catholicks*, and in reſpect to his avowed Principles; but my charge here is by an enraged Adverſary; and for ſuch a Doctrine which is owned by all Men of Underſtanding in both Churches, and if I may name him among them, even by *J. Serjeant* himſelf. My words are, *If it be ſaid, that the Churches Power will become explicit to any ſober Enquirer, then every ſuch Perſon may without the Churches help find out all neceſſary Points of Faith.* And where lies the Hereſie, the Enthuſiaſm, the Atheiſm of this Doctrine, which I have already ſhewed was aſſerted both by Fathers and School-men? And *J. Serjeant* himſelf grants, that every Man is to judge for his own Salvation; and of the beſt way to his Salvation, and of all the Controverſies between them and us, and eſpecially of the true Grounds of Faith; and all this without the Churches help. And if he can do all this, I deſire to know whether he cannot find out all Neceſſary Points of Faith? Hath he indeed reſolved all Controverſies, and yet wants ſome neceſſary Points of Faith? And hath he found out the Churches Authority too, without the Churches Help, and yet doth he want ſome neceſſary Points of Faith? Then it follows, that after the ſubmitting to the Churches Authority, there are ſtill neceſſary Points of Faith which may be wanting; and then an abſolute Submiſſion is not all that is required of one that hath found out the Churches Authority. But my whole Argument there proceeds upon a Suppoſition, *viz.* that if one may without the Churches Help find out the Churches Authority in Scripture, then why not all neceſſary Points of Faith? So that it goes upon a Parity of Reaſon; and I ſee no Anſwer at all given or pretended, but onely he endeavours to ſtop my Mouth with a handful of Dirt.

Second Letter, p. 21.

Thus I have diſpatched this long Argument about the *Judgment of Diſcretion*. And I ſhall now ſum up my Anſwer in theſe particulars.

I. Every Chriſtian, as ſuch, is bound to enquire after the true Way to Salvation, and hath a Capacity of Judging concerning it.

II. Every Chriſtian proceeding according to the beſt Rules of judging, hath Reaſon to receive the Scripture as the Rule of his Faith.

III. The Scripture is ſo plain in all Neceſſaries, and God hath promiſed ſuch Aſſiſtance to them, that ſincerely ſeek it, that none who do ſo, ſhall want the knowledge of ſuch things as are neceſſary to their Salvation.

IV. When any thing is offer'd as neceſſary to be believed in order to Salvation, every Chriſtian hath a Right and Liberty of Judging, whether it can be proved by the Scripture to be ſo neceſſary or not.

V. We do not allow to particular Perſons the ſame Faculty of Judging in doubtful Points of Controverſie which we do as to Matters that immediately concern their Salvation.

VI. No pretence of Infallibility or Authority can take away that Right of Judging, which was allowed them by the Apoſtles, whoſe Authority was Infallible.

VII. This

VII. This Right of Judging doth not exclude the Churches due Authority as to Matters of Faith and Controverſies of Religion, (as it is declared *Art.* 20. of our Church) but all that we now plead for, is (not any Authority as to others) but a Right of Judging as to themſelves, in Matters that concern their Salvation.

VIII. The Certainty of Faith, as to them, depends upon two Things; 1. The Clearneſs of Scripture about them, which implies the *Certainty* of *Reaſon*. 2. The Promiſe of Divine Aſſiſtance which makes their *Faith Divine*, both as to its *Principle*, its *Ground*, and its *Effect*.

But I have not yet ended his *Objections* about our Rule of Faith; For

VI. He objects, *That we cannot neceſſarily reſolve our Faith into the Writings of the Apoſtles onely.* What is the meaning *that we cannot neceſſarily reſolve it?* I think we muſt Reſolve it into a Written Rule, till we ſee another proved. *Third Letter, Page, 34.*

*Did the Apoſtles when they went to convert the World, go with Books in their Hands, or Words in their Mouths?* Doubtleſs, *with Words in their Mouths. Or were thoſe Words a jot leſs Sacred, when they came from their Mouths, than when they put them in a Book?* Not one jot. *Or laſtly, doth any Command from Chriſt appear to write the Book of Scripture, or any Revelation beforehand, that it was to be a Rule of Faith to the future Church? No ſuch matter; and the Accidental Occaſions of its writing at firſt, and its Acceptation afterwards bar any ſuch pretences. On the other ſide, their grand Commiſſion was not* ſcribite, *but onely* prædicate Evangelium.

I have given an Account ſo lately of the Reaſons and Occaſions of writing the *Goſpels* and *Epiſtles* of the New Teſtament, that I need onely here to give theſe general Anſwers.

I. Whatſoever was done as to the Writing the Books of the New Teſtament, was done by the immediate Direction and Appointment of the Holy Ghoſt. *Luke*, 1. 4. *Joh.* 20. 31.

II. The Reaſon given, by the Writers of the Goſpels themſelves, is, that Matters of Faith might be delivered with the greateſt Certainty.

III. Thoſe Writings were not intended onely for the Benefit of the Church then being, but for future Ages; and thence the Books of Scripture were ſo received and eſteemed in the Primitive Churches.

IV. The moſt Antient Writers of the Chriſtian Church aſſure us, that the Apoſtles wrote the ſame Doctrine they taught, and for that purpoſe, that they might be *a Pillar and Foundation of Faith.*

V. The moſt certain way we now have to know what Doctrine the Apoſtles taught is by their Writings; ſince they taught and wrote the ſame Doctrine; and we are certain we have the Doctrine they wrote, but we have no other Way to be certain what Doctrine they taught.

VII. He objects, *That the Queſtion being put concerning the New Teſtament's containing all Divine Revelations of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, I gave no direct Anſwer, but ſhuffled it off to Matters neceſſary to Salvation.* The ſetting out of this is the Subject of ſome pages. To which I give an eaſie Anſwer. *Third Letter p. 38. 39, 40*

The

The Queſtion concerning the New Teſtament containing all the Divine Revelations of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, may be taken in two Senſes.

1. As relating to the *entire Object* of Faith; and ſo the Anſwer was moſt direct and plain, to the ſecond Queſtion, "That the Rule, where- "by we hold all the ſame Doctrine, that was taught by Chriſt and his "Apoſtles, is by the Divine Revelations contained in the Writings of "the New Teſtament. For ſince we believe all that is there, and nothing but what is there, that muſt contain the Entire Object of our Faith. And the word *All* muſt relate to that.

2. As to all thoſe things which particular Perſons are bound to believe, as contained therein; and ſo the Queſtion being put, about *the Univerſal Teſtimony to aſſure us*, i. e. all particular Chriſtians, *That the New Teſtament contained all the Divine Revelations of Chriſt and his Apoſtles*: My Anſwer was direct and appoſite to this Senſe, *viz.* that the Univerſal Teſtimony of the Chriſtian Church, as to the Book of Scripture, and Doctrine therein contained, is a ſufficient Ground to make us certain, *i. e.* all particular Perſons, of all Matters neceſſary to our Salvation. So that the Subſtance of my Anſwer lies in thſe three things.

I. That all our Faith is contained in Scripture; and thereby we hold all the Doctrine taught by Chriſt and his Apoſtles.

II. That although all particular Perſons may not reach to the entire Object of Faith contained in Scripture, yet they had hereby a Certainty, as to all Matters neceſſary to their Salvation.

III. That the Ground of Certainty as to both theſe, was the Univerſal Teſtimony of the Chriſtian Church, concerning the Books of Scripture, and the Doctrine contained therein.

*Second Letter*, p. 17. The Words of my Letter are, "We are to conſider, that the Scri- "pture being our ſole and entire Rule of Faith, all Matters neceſſary "to Salvation, muſt be ſuppoſed to be contained therein; and there- "fore the ſame Teſtimony, which delivers the Scripture to us, doth "deliver all the neceſſary Articles as contained therein. Which are "there received as in the Lump; and if we receive the Book which "contains all, we muſt by the ſame Authority receive all contained "in it. As if a Purſe be left to a Man by his Father's Will, full of Gold "and Silver, and this by the Executors be declared to contain all the "Gold and Silver his Father left him, they who deliver this Purſe to "him from the Executors, do certainly deliver to him all the Gold "and Silver left him by his Father. But if he ſuſpects there was both "Gold and Silver left him by his Father, which was not in that Purſe, "then he muſt call in Queſtion the Integrity of the Executors, who de- "clared that all was contained therein. This is now the Caſe of the "Chriſtian Church, as to all Divine Truths which reſpect Mens Sal- "vation; the Primitive Church, who anſwer to the Executors in the "other Caſe, did unanimouſly declare that all ſuch Truths were "undoubtedly contained in the Written Word. Although therefore "there may be a real Difference in the nature of the Doctrines there- "in contained, as there is between Gold and Silver, yet he that re- "ceives all, muſt receive one as well as the other; and the Matters of

"Salvation,

" Salvation, being of greateſt Moment, they that receive the whole
" Will of God upon Grounds of Certainty, muſt be aſſured that there-
" in they receive all Matters neceſſary to our Salvation.

Never was any Purſe ſo rifled as this is by *J. Serjeant*; he examines not only the Coin in it, but the very *Strings* and *Linings* of it. He is a dreadful Man at ranſacking a Metaphor. He tells me, *My Similitude is ſo far from running on four Legs, that it is in many regards lame on the right (and indeed only) Foot it ought to ſtand on; and which is worſe, perhaps againſt my ſelf. The Sum of it amounts to this, that becauſe Scripture contains all, and Proteſtants have Scripture, therefore they have all. A ſtrange kind of Diſcourſe! As if, becauſe they have it in a Book, therefore they have it in their Minds and Souls, in which, and no where elſe Faith is to reſide.* Third Letter, P. 40.

But was not the Queſtion put, whether we had *All the Points of Faith which our Saviour taught?* And how could I anſwer a Queſtion about *All*, but by ſhewing where we had *All?* If All the Doctrine of Chriſt be there, we muſt be certain we have All, if we have the Scripture which contains All. For I profeſs to believe every thing there, and nothing as a Point of Faith but what is there. We do not pretend, that it is enough for Perſons to ſay, their Faith is in ſuch a Book; but we grant that they ought to read and ſearch, and actually believe whatever they find in that Book; but ſtill all Points are not equally neceſſary to all Perſons that are therein contained, but all ſuch as are neceſſary to Salvation, lie there open to the Capacities of all who deſire to know them.

Now this is one of the things *J. Serjeant* finds fault with this Similitude of a Purſe for, *viz. That People think it is an eaſy thing to open, and as eaſy to come at the Senſe of Scripture, as to take Money out of a Purſe: 'Tis but plucking the Strings, and the Deed is done.* And is this any Diſparagement to a Rule of Faith to be plain and eaſy? If it were not ſo, it could not be a Rule of Faith for all Perſons. We do not ſay, that any Perſon by opening the Scriptures, may preſently attain to the certain Senſe of all Places of Scripture; but that which I aſſert, is, That no Man who ſets himſelf to read and conſider the Scriptures as he ought, and prays for Wiſdom from God, ſhall miſs of knowing all things neceſſary to his Salvation. But Mr. *Serjeant* is for mending the Similitude, and truly he doth it after an extraordinary manner. *He will allow the Scriptures to be a Purſe, provided the Purſe's Mouth were tied up with a Knot of ſuch a myſterious Contrivance, that none could open it but thoſe who knew the Mind of the Bequeather; and that the Church, to which it was left as a Legacy, had Knowledge of his Mind, and ſo could open it, whilſt others only perplexed themſelves more while they went about it.*

The Point then between us is, whether the Scripture were left onely to the Church to interpret it to the People in all Points; or whether it were intended for the general Good of the whole Church, ſo as thereby to direct themſelves in their Way to Heaven; and conſequently, whether it may not be opened and underſtood by all Perſons in Matters that are neceſſary to their Salvation.

One would think by the Church of *Rome*'s Management of the Scripture, keeping it ſo much out of the Peoples Hands, and talking ſo much of the Danger and Miſchief that comes by it, that they did eſteem

eſteem it juſt as the old *Romans* did the *Sybilline* Oracles, which were to be kept up from the View of the People, and only to be conſulted in Caſes of great Difficulty, and no farther Queſtions were to be asked, but what the Keepers of them declared to be their Meaning, was to be ſo received without any farther Examination. And this is the Senſe of the Politicians of that Church concerning the Scripture.

But when they have written like *Divines*, and have been driven to ſtate the Controverſie truly, they have been forced to ſuch Conceſſions as have overthrown the *Political Hypotheſis*. For,

I. They cannot deny that the Scripture was deſigned to be a certain and infallible Rule of Faith to all. This *Bellarmine* proves in the beginning of his Controverſies; where he ſhews at large, That the Law was the Rule in the *Old Teſtament*. *To the Law and to the Teſtimony. Bleſſed are they that ſearch thy Commandments*, &c. That in the *New Teſtament* Chriſt proves his Doctrine by the Scriptures, and refers the Phariſees to the Scriptures, and confuted the Sadducees out of them. That the Apoſtles direct Chriſtians to honour, and eſteem, and to rely upon them. And then he proves, that a Rule of Faith muſt be certain and known; and for the Scriptures, he ſaith, *Nihil eſt notius, nihil certius*; Nothing is more known, nothing more certain. How can this be, if there be ſuch *myſtical Knots which tye it together, that none but the Church-Guides can unlooſe?* How can this then ever be ſo known, as to be a Rule of Faith to the People? And not meerly *a Rule, but a moſt certain and ſafe Rule.* Which is the greateſt Nonſenſe in the World, if it cannot be underſtood by thoſe who are to make it their Rule. They may as well ſay, That *Algebra* was a Rule for Maſons and Carpenters, and a *Jacob*'s Staff for a Taylor's Meaſure.

*Bell. de verbo Dei*, l. 1. 2.

But Mr. *Serjeant* hath beaten his Brains ſo long about *Rules* and *Rulers*, and that which is *ruled* and *regulated* by them. that we muſt not expect that he ſhould be tied down to Cardinal *Bellarmine*'s Notions; and therefore I muſt conſider what he ſaith, after above twenty Years hard Labour about theſe things.

*Third Letter*, p. 81.

*He tells me plainly, I quite miſtake the Meaning of the Word Rule. For* (ſaith he) *it ſpeaks Rectitude.* No doubt a right Rule doth. *But ſtill I miſtake his Meaning.* How ſo? There muſt be a *Rectitude* in the Rule. *That is not it.* What then? *It muſt be evident Rectitude*, i. e. Evident to be right. *Not ſo.* I hope we ſhall come at it at laſt. *It is ſuch an evident Rectitude as preſerves thoſe who regulate themſelves by it from Obliquity or Deviation, that is, in our Caſe, from Error.* And is this the wonderful Myſtery? There wants but one Word to make it paſt Diſpute, *viz.* who *effectually regulate themſelves by it.* For *Regulating* is an ambiguous Word, and may be taken either, 1. For what a Man takes and profeſſes to be his *Rule*, which he is to act by; ſo a *Ciceronian regulates* himſelf by *Cicero*, *i. e.* He declares his *Manner of Speech* to be the *Rule* he orders his Speech by. And yet it is very poſſible that ſuch a Man may uſe Phraſes which are not *Cicero*'s, for want of ſufficient Skill and Care. 2. For what he doth in Conformity to his Rule. And ſo he doth *regulate* himſelf by *Cicero*, who doth not in the leaſt ſwerve from his Manner of Speaking. But *Cicero* is the Rule to both theſe. And ſo the Queſtion here comes to this, Whether that can be ſaid to be a true Intellectual Rule, which Men through their own

own Default, and not through any Defect in the Rule, may deviate from? If a Rule be in it self certain, and be certainly received for a Rule, that is surely enough to make it a Rule to a Man; but it is not necessary to the Being of a Rule, that a Man can never deviate from it by his own Fault. For, there is no Intellectual Rule can be assigned, but it is possible for a free Agent to deviate from; although he do at the same time profess it to be his Rule. Do not all Christians agree the Commands of Christ to be an Infallible Rule of Life? And *J. Serjeant* by his admirable Logick will either prove this not to be a Rule, or that it is impossible for Men to sin. For, saith he, *a Rule speaks Rectitude, and that such an evident one as preserves those who regulate themselves by it from Obliquity or Deviation.* Yes, saith he, this is very plain, those who regulate themselves by Christ's Rule, cannot sin: I grant it, those who do effectually regulate themselves by it; but others may profess this to be their Rule, and the most Infallible Rule of Life, and yet through their own Fault may deviate from it. So here Persons may own the Scripture to be a most certain and infallible Rule as to Truth and Falshood; and they are sure while they effectually *regulate* themselves by it, they can never err; but while they profess to do it, they may. So that all Mr. *Serjeant*'s Subtilty vanishes into a nothing, by so plain and easy a Distinction. Therefore I am still of the mind, that a Rule of Faith is that whereby we are to judge what we are bound to believe as to Divine Revelations. No, saith *J. Serjeant* I ought to have said, *It is that by which, while we follow it, we shall be absolutely secured from erring in Faith.* This follows from the *Rectitude* of the Rule, that while Men keep to it, they cannot err; but it doth not follow from the Nature of the Rule, that Men must necessarily follow it. For is it possible for Men to misunderstand a Certain Rule or not? *i. e.* such a Rule which if they truly follow, they shall be secured from Erring: If not, then the Rule must be plain and evident to all Capacities, to such a degree, that they cannot fail in judging by it. If it be possible, then, although the Rule be in it self certain and infallible, yet it is possible for Men to err through such a Mistake; and while they think they follow the Rule, they may run into Error. And it is strange to me that Mr. *Serjeant* in all this time hath not discerned the Fallacy that hath misled him. If it hath really misled him, and not been set up by him, on purpose to confound and confute Hereticks, as he tells the Cardinals at *Rome*. But one of that number hath fully proved, as I have shewed already, that the Scripture was intended for a Rule of Faith to the People; and then it follows from *J. Serjeant* himself, that while they regulate themselves by it, they can never err. What Reason then can be given, why such a Rule of Faith should be kept from them? And the Purse should be tied up with so many mysterious Knots, which are utterly inconsistent with the Notion of a Rule of Faith.

II. They grant, That there is a great difference in the Points contained in Scripture; of which some are allowed to be *simply necessary to Salvation*, as those which are required to Baptism; and *Bellarmine* yields, *That all these Points are certainly contained in Scripture, and were the things which the Apostles constantly preached to all People:* Who cannot be denied to have been capable of understanding these things, when they heard them preached; and how could they lose the Capacity of understanding them when they were written? And if they might

*Bell. de verbo Dei*, l. 4. c. 11.

ſtill Underſtand them, then the Scripture hath no ſuch *Myſterious Knots*, but all Points neceſſary to Salvation may be underſtood by the People. So that as to theſe Points of greateſt Importance, the Scripture muſt be left as a Legacy to all Chriſtians, and not onely to the Guides of the Church.

*Third Letter*, p. 44. But *J. Serjeant* craves leave to Explain himſelf; and it is great pity to deny it him. *Miſtake me not*, ſaith he, *I do not mean Scriptures Letter is not clear in ſuch Paſſages as concern Morality, or the X. Commandments; nor in Matters of Fact, as the Marks or Signs of the Meſſias foretold by the Prophets*; (Methinks the *Myſterious Knots* ſhould have been about *Prophecies*,) *nor in Parables explained by himſelf and ſuch like*; *but in Dogmatical Points or Tenets, which are Spiritual, and oftentimes profound Myſteries, as a Trinity, Chriſt's God-head, the Real Preſence of his Body in the Sacrament, and ſuch like*; *and in ſuch as theſe our Rule is not intelligible enough to keep the Followers of it from Erring*. I Anſwer, Either the Apoſtles Preached theſe Points to all Perſons as *neceſſary to their Salvation*, or they did not. If not, how come they to be *neceſſary* to be believed now? If they did, then the People were capable of Underſtanding them when they heard them, and therefore may as well underſtand them when they read them. I do not mean the *Manner* as to the *Trinity* and *Incarnation* (as to *Tranſubſtantiation*, I know nothing in Scripture about it either as to *Thing* or *Manner*) but the Revelation of ſuch a Doctrine. So that if theſe Points be owned to be *neceſſary to Salvation*, they muſt be ſo plain that Men may underſtand their Duty to believe them. For, that is the Bound I keep my ſelf within, that all things Neceſſary to Salvation, are ſo plain, that we may be certain of our Duty to believe them; but if not, we may Err without Prejudice to our Salvation.

Page 48. Mr. *Serjeant* asks *what I mean by all things neceſſary to Salvation*. Nothing but what all others do mean by it: *Did Chriſt* (ſaith he) *teach any unneceſſary Points?* Alas for him! But are all Points taught by Chriſt, or written in Scripture, equally neceſſary to the Salvation of all People? No, he ſaith preſently after, *That he will grant that fewer means than the Knowledge of all Chriſt taught, may ſuffice for the Salvation of ſome particular Perſons*. Very well; now I hope he will make ſomething of the main buſineſs in hand, *viz.* To prove that Abſolute Certainty of all that Chriſt Taught, is Neceſſary to Mens Salvation, when he grants that ſome may be Saved, without ſo much as *Knowing all that Chriſt Taught*. To what purpoſe was all this Heat about the Certainty of our Faith, as to all that Chriſt Taught, if at laſt ſome may be Saved without ſo much as Knowing it? How doth Mr. *Serjeant* prove, That thoſe *ſome* are onely the Ignorant People in the Church of *Rome*; but that all Ours are tied to no leſs than Infallible Certainty of all that Chriſt Taught. He would have done well, to have proved ſuch a Privilege for Ignorance to have been limited to their Communion; and that no Claim can be allowed as to the Circumſtances of

Page 48. any other particular Perſons. *Some few* (he ſaith again) *may be Saved without Knowledge of ſuch and ſuch Points, ſlender Motives being enough for their Circumſtances*. I thank Mr. *Serjeant* for this. It ſeems that Point as to *Salvation* is gained, unleſs particular Perſons among us can be proved to be none of theſe few. But where-ever they are, it ſeems *they may be Saved*; but I hope, not without True and Saving Faith; whence it follows, that ſuch Faith hath no neceſſary Relation to theſe high

high Points; and there is no need of Infallible Certainty, as to them, of all Chriſt Taught. One of theſe high Points, is that of *Tranſubſtantiation*; too high for me and Thouſands and Millions beſides, ever to apprehend, let us do our utmoſt; nay we cannot apprehend (ſuch is our Dulneſs) that we can have any Certainty, as to Senſe or Reaſon, if we hold it. We hope therefore *J. Serjeant* will enlarge his Number, and not talk onely of *ſome Few that may be Saved* without the Knowledge of ſuch deep Myſteries; we deſire to be admitted into his Number, for truly our Capacities can never be ſtretched ſo far, as to comprehend the Poſſibility of Tranſubſtantiation. Suppoſe *our Motives be ſlender*, yet they are ſuch as move us to that degree, that we cannot overcome the Reluctancies of Senſe, and Reaſon, and Revelation, and Tradition againſt it. *Ibid.*

But Mr. *Serjeant* brings himſelf off with a *Salvo*; *Though all Points are not neceſſary for every particular Perſon, yet all of them are neceſſary for the Body of the Church, whoſe Paſtors are to Inſtruct their Children in them, and apply the Efficacy of them to their Souls, as their Capacities admit, and Exigencies require.* It ſeems ſtill they are not Neceſſary to particular Perſons, but according to their Capacities and Exigencies, but *they are to the Body of the Church.* But how came they to be Neceſſary to the Body of the Church? For Inſtance, The Point of Tranſubſtantiation is a very deep Point; and although particular Perſons may be Saved without believing it, yet I cannot underſtand how this deep Point comes to be Neceſſary, in any Reſpect, for the Body of the Church. I hope *J. Serjeant* will not deny this to be one of his Neceſſary Church-Points: Let him then ſhew, how it comes to be ſo *Neceſſary for the Paſtors of the Church to Inſtruct their Children in it.* My *Capacity*, I aſſure him, will not reach to this, and therefore I hope I may be excuſed; and in his own words, my mind is not capable of *being cultivated by ſuch elevating Conſiderations.* I do not believe there is any ſuch danger of *the Flocks dying, or falling ſhort of their full growth they might have had in the Plentiful Paſturage of the Church*, as *J. Serjeant* elegantly ſpeaks, if they do not believe *Tranſubſtantiation*, or any ſuch *deep Points.* Page 49.

But ſtill *we have no Abſolute Certainty of our higheſt Fundamentals.* No? We affirm the Contrary; and from Abſolutely Certain Grounds. It is *Abſolutely Certain*, that whatever God Reveals is true, and ought to be believed by us. And we are as abſolutely Certain, as Scripture and Reaſon can make us, that God hath Revealed the Fundamentals of our Faith. *But there is Experience to the Contrary.* What Experience? That we are not Certain? We affirm that we are; and who can tell beſt? How comes Mr. *Serjeant* to know we are not Certain, when we ſay we are? *But all are not, as Socinians*, &c. What are they to us? Are not we certain, becauſe ſome are not *Certain?* What pitiful Reaſoning is this? Is Mr. *Serjeant* Certain of his *Infallible Ground* of Certainty, *Oral Tradition? Why do I aſk ſuch a Queſtion?* For very good Reaſon; becauſe there are ſome not Certain of it, and even in his own Church; but cry out upon it, as Fallible, Fallacious, Dangerous, and Deſtructive of Faith, and leading to Atheiſm. From whence it follows, on Mr. *Serjeant*'s Principles, that he cannot be Certain himſelf, becauſe others are not. Nay, it is impoſſible he ſhould have any Certainty on his own Grounds. For he can have no Rule of Certainty, as I ſhall evidently prove from his own Words. A Rule muſt have *Abſolute Certainty*; Abſolute Certainty there cannot be where Perſons are left un-

certain; but there are many in the Church of *Rome*, that not onely doubt of his Rule of Infallible Certainty, but utterly deny it, and diſpute againſt it. How is it then poſſible for him to be certain of it on his own Grounds?

But it is time to proceed to another Objection againſt our Rule of Faith.

*Third Leter. Page*, 50. VIII. *J. Serjeant* ſaith, *We can be no more certain of our Rule, than we are of the Truth of the Letter of Scripture; but we cannot be certain we have the right Letter, unleſs we have a right Tranſlation, and that muſt be from a true Copy: No Copy can be true, unleſs conformable to the Original; and if there be any Failure in any of theſe, nay, if we have not abſolute Certainty of all theſe, we cannot have any abſolute Certainty of our Faith.*

This *Objection* thoſe of the Church of *Rome*, who believe Scripture to be a Rule of Faith, (though not the complete) are concerned to anſwer as well as we. For, the Matters of Faith contained in Scripture are convey'd to their Minds after the ſame manner. But Mr. *Serjeant* ſaith, *Their Caſe is different from ours.* Do not they make the *vulgar Tranſlation authentick?* And will not the ſame Objections then lie againſt all thoſe who rely upon it? Let us ſee how *J. Serjeant* clears this Matter: 1. *The Canon of the Books comes down*, ſaith he, *by the Teſtimony of all Chriſtian Churches, that are truly Chriſtian.* And we ſay, the Canon of the Books comes down by the concurrent Teſtimony of all Chriſtian Churches, however differing in other things. And herein, I think, we have much the Advantage: For, we do not except againſt the Teſtimony of any Chriſtian Churches, nor condemn them as not truly Chriſtian, till their Cauſe be better heard and examin'd.

*Page* 51. 2. *The Doctrine of Chriſt*, ſaith he, *transfuſed into the Hearts of the Faithful, both taught them how, and obliged them to correct the Copy in thoſe particular Texts that concerned Faith.* What is this, but in plain Terms to expoſe the Scriptures to the Scorn and Contempt of Atheiſts and Infidels? Who would deſire no better a Conceſſion than this, that the Scripture hath been corrected in Matters of Faith, according to the Faith of the Church. If this be granted, it is impoſſible to prove that we have any true Original Texts, *in Matters of Faith*: For if the Church did correct the Copy in thoſe particular Texts, which concerned Faith, according to the Senſe of the Faithful, then the Church in every Age might ſo correct it: And conſequently we can never be ſure, that the Texts continue the ſame for any two Ages together, unleſs it be firſt proved impoſſible for the Senſe of the Church to vary in any two Ages, or of thoſe who think themſelves bound to correct the Texts. And I ſhould be very ſorry to have my Faith reſt upon ſuch a ſlippery Foundation. I will put the Caſe as to the *Arian Controverſy*. How was it poſſible for the *Nicene* Fathers to have convinced the *Arians* on ſuch a Suppoſition as this? "You alledge ſeveral "Texts of Scripture, might they ſay, to prove the God-head "of Chriſt, and his Equality with the Father; but how then "can we know that theſe were Original Texts, and not cor- "rected by the Guides of the Church then, according to their own "Senſe? We do not deny that there were ſome leading Men of this "Opinion, and having gained a Party to themſelves, they corrected "the *Texts* according to it: And therefore we can never be ſatis- "fied that theſe were the Original Texts, becauſe we can bring down "a Tradition of a contrary Senſe from the Apoſtles times. I do not

see what Satisfaction they could ever receive, if this pernicious Principle be allowed, that the Texts were to be corrected in Matters that concern Faith, according to the Sense of the Church. But he saith it is, *If any Error, through the Carelesness, Unattentiveness, or Malice of the Translators or Transcribers, at any time had crept in.* This doth not one jot mend the Matter; for if the Faith of the present Church be the Rule, then the Texts are to be corrected according to it, and the Blame to be laid on the Carelesness or Malice of Translators and Transcribers. This is a miserable Account of the *Certainty of Texts of Scripture in Points of Faith*: As to *other Texts of inferiour Concern*, as he speaks, *they could be best corrected by Multitudes of other ancient Copies, the Churches Care still going along, as was shewn in the highest manner by the Council of* Trent, *that so it might be as exact as Human Diligence could well render it.* As to Multitudes of Copies, they serve us as well as them; but as to the Care of the Council of *Trent*, I am by no means satisfied. For, 1. They went no farther than a Translation, and declared that authentick, without due Regard to the Original Text. 2. The Care taken was not so exact; for then *Clemens* VIII. did great Injury to *Sixtus* V. when he recalled and corrected his Bibles in so many Places, after *Sixtus* V. had published his for an exact Edition. 3. There are still Complaints in the Church of *Rome* of want of Exactness in the vulgar Latin. 4. After all this is but *Human Diligence*, and no such *Absolute Certainty*, as *J. Serjeant* requires from us.

But it may be, he will say, *That he doth not at all make it his Rule of Faith:* Let him declare so much, and then we know what to answer. *This is still putting off.* Therefore I will give a distinct Answer.

I. We do utterly deny that it is in any Church's Power to *correct Original Texts, because they contradict the Sense of the present Church*; or any Translations, any farther than they differ from the Originals. And I do not know any Assertion that shakes more our Faith, as to the Scripture, than this of *J. Serjeant* doth.

II. The early Appeals made to *Scripture* in Matters of Faith by the Writers of the Christian Church, make us certain, that there could be no such *Alterations* or *Corrections* of the Texts, according to the Sense of the Correctors. As for Instance; We find the Places produced against the *Arians*, used before against the *Samosatenians* and *Artemonites.*

If it be said, *They might correct the Fathers too.* I answer, That there is no imaginable Ground for any such Suspicion, because the Fathers lived in distant Places and Countries; and therefore when their Testimonies agree about some Places of Scripture alledged by them, there can be no Reason to suspect any Corruption or Alteration of the Text. As for Instance; no one Text of the whole New Testament hath been more suspected than that of 1 St. *John* 5. 7. *There are Three that bear Record in Heaven*, &c. And it cannot be denied, that there have been great Variety both in the Greek and Latin Manuscripts about it; yea, there was so in St. *Jerom*'s time, as appears by his Preface to the Canonical Epistles, who charges the leaving it out to the Unfaithfulness of the Translators. St. *Jerom* is cried out upon as a Party in this Controversy, and therefore it is said on the other side, that he put it in as favouring his own Opinion. But his Integrity is vindicated herein, because St. *Cyprian* so long before the *Arian Controversy* produced this Place. *S. Cyprian de Unit. Epist. ad Jubai.*

Place. So that our Certainty as to Scripture doth not depend upon the meer Letter, but upon comparing the beſt and moſt ancient Copies with the Writings of the Fathers, who ſtill made Uſe of the Scriptures in all Diſcourſes and Debates about Matters of Faith.

III. The *Variety of Readings* in Matters that are not of Faith cannot hinder our Certainty in Matters of Faith. We do not pretend that there is no kind of Variety in the Copies of the New Teſtament; but I am of Opinion that this rather eſtabliſhes than weakens our Faith. For conſidering the great Multitudes of them, and how inſignificant they are, it ſhews that this Book was liable to the common Accidents of Books; but yet, that there is no ſuch Variety as to make one ſuſpect any Fraud or Deſign in the Alterations that appear in the Manuſcript Copies. And as to Tranſlations that have been made among us, the People who are not able to examine them by the Originals, have no Reaſon to ſuſpect them, as to any Matter of Faith; not meerly from the Skill and Integrity of the Perſons, and the Care that hath been taken, but becauſe it was ſo much the Concernment of ſome Men to have leſſend the Credit of our Tranſlations as much as was poſſible, and they have not been able to produce any thing that might ſhake the Faith of a conſidering Man.

If it be ſaid after all, This is but *Human Faith*, and not *Divine*; I anſwer,

IV. We muſt be careful to diſtinguiſh the Certainty of *Human* and *Divine Faith* in this Matter. We do not pretend that we have an abſolute Divine Certainty of things that are only capable of Human Certainty; and we do not ſay, that we have onely Human Certainty of things capable of *Divine Certainty*. If the Queſtion be put concerning the *Objects* of *Divine Faith*, then we do anſwer, That we have a *Divine Certainty* of them from thoſe things which are the proper Evidence of Divine Revelation. We believe the Doctrine of Chriſt with a Divine Faith, becauſe it was confirmed by Miracles and Prophecies: We believe the New Teſtament to be written by the Holy Spirit, becauſe the Promiſe of the Spirit was fulfilled upon them, and eſpecially in a thing of ſo great Concernment to the whole Chriſtian Church. But if the Queſtion be asked onely concerning a Matter of Fact, as whether the Books that bear ſuch Names were written by the Perſons whoſe Names they bear, then I can have no greater Certainty than belongs to a Matter of Fact; but then it is ſo circumſtantiated, that I have a greater and more abſolute Certainty as to this, than any other Matter of Fact which wants the Proofs that this hath. And if as to Books, and Copies, and Tranſlations, we have as high a Certainty as the thing is capable of, it is Madneſs to expect and require more. For where there is but a Human Teſtimony, there cannot be the Certainty of Divine Faith, which muſt not only have a Divine Object, but muſt reſt on a Divine Teſtimony; but where the Teſtimony is *Human*, the Certainty muſt be ſuch as relates to the higheſt of that kind. But ſtill, ſuch a Faith may have abſolute Certainty of its kind; and altho' in regard of its Teſtimony it be Human Faith, yet in regard both of its *Object*, its *inward Cauſe*, and its *Effects*, it may be truly called *Divine*.

IX. The

IX. The laſt *Objection* is, concerning *the Number of Canonical Books.* *Pray ſatisfie us* (ſaith Mr. *Serjeant*) *about this exact Number of Books, and how many will juſt ſerve turn.* One would think by his Objections, *J. Serjeant* were preparing Matter for the *Critical Hiſtory* of the *New Teſtament*, he ſeems ſo concerned to leſſen the Authority of it. But I ſhall anſwer the Objections he offers. *Third Letter*, P. 58.

1. *There may have been Books loſt that were written by Perſons divinely inſpir'd, and we have no unanimous Conſent of the Chriſtian Church, that there is none loſt; and thoſe Books might contain Matters different from, or to be ſuperadded to the Canon we have now; and without this, we can have no Certainty, that the Books we have now, contained all the Divine Revelations.* I anſwer, Page 56.

I. If we have the unanimous Conſent of the Chriſtian Church, that we have the Canon of the *New Teſtament* entire, then we have their Conſent, that there is no Book, written by Divine Inſpiration, loſt. And this appears by the Conteſt in the IVth Century, about the juſt Number of the Canonical Books. The Churches then differ'd about ſome Books not then univerſally receiv'd, as the *Apocalypſe* in ſome, and the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews* in others: Which ſhews, that the Churches were then ſo ſolicitous to preſerve any Books that appear'd to be written by Perſons inſpir'd, that although theſe did then want univerſal Conſent, yet they were ſtill kept, and read, and diſpers'd, till upon further Examination they came to be univerſally read. It is not therefore in the leaſt probable they ſhould ſuffer any Apoſtolical Writings to be loſt.

II. This is to charge the Chriſtian Church with ſo groſs a Neglect, as overthrows the Force of all his Arguments for Tradition: For we muſt ſuppoſe an Apoſtolical Writing ſent to ſome Church by Direction of the Holy Spirit, and yet that Church be ſo notoriouſly careleſs, as to loſe a Book containing in it many Points of Faith. Now I appeal to any one of common Senſe, whether he could truſt their Word for Matters of Faith, who could be ſo negligent as to loſe a great many Points of Faith at once. And the more ſuch a Book were diſperſed, the Argument is ſtill ſtronger againſt *Tradition.* Beſides, this ſhews the great Inſufficiency of Oral Tradition, if theſe Points of Faith are loſt, becauſe ſuch a Book was loſt wherein they were contained. If Tradition had been ſo effectual a Means of conveying Matters of Faith, it ſhould have appear'd in ſuch a Caſe, *viz.* in preſerving ſuch Matters of Faith, tho' the Books were loſt: But we find nothing like this ſo much as pretended, altho' it were much eaſier pretended than proved.

III. This is to ſuppoſe the Providence of God not to be immediately concerned in preſerving Books written by Divine Inſpiration. Mr. *Serjeant* doth really ſuppoſe that Books written by Divine Inſpiration may have been loſt, or at leaſt that we cannot prove that they are not: But we think it a conſiderable Proof that they could not, becauſe the Divine Providence doth ſo immediately concern it ſelf in preſerving that which tends ſo much to the Good of his Church.

*If*

*If a Hair doth not fall from our Heads, nor a Sparrow fall on the Ground,*
Mat. 10. 29, 30. without the Providence of God (as our Saviour affirms) is it not very unreasonable to suppose that a Divine Book, written for the Benefit of the Christian Church, should be wholly lost? Especially considering the extraordinary Care the first Christians took, in Times of the greatest Persecutions, to preserve the Scriptures; and no force or violence could extort them out of their hands. On Mr. *Serjeant*'s Supposition, it was no hard Matter for a Book of Scripture to be lost, *viz.* if the several Books had been committed to the Custody of some Men in Trust for the whole Church; but if we consider the things as they really were, it will appear hardly possible. For the Books were not kept up at first in a few hands, but dispersed abroad in multitudes of Copies, and received with mighty Veneration both on the Account of the Authors of them, and the Matters contained in them. They were read both in Publick and in Private, they heard them in their Assemblies, and they made them their constant Employment at home; they were their Rule of Life, as well as of Faith. And how is it possible to suppose any Book so received, so esteemed, so dispersed, so constantly read, could be suffer'd to be lost among Christians?

If it be Objected, *That they were not all so esteemed at first, as appears by Epistle to the Hebrews, and therefore might more easily be lost*; I Answer, That however they were not universally received at first, yet they were by those Churches to whom they were written; and among them they were not kept up, but mightily dispersed; so that there was no way to lose them, from the first spreading of them abroad; unless we can suppose such multitudes of Christians to conspire together to suppress a Book of so great Concernment to themselves. As if Persons who claim an Estate by virtue of some Deeds, should all agree to imbezel them, or any material part of them. Here was no pretence for Registers and Abridgments, which some make use of to lessen the Authority of the Books of the *Old Testament*; for here we have the very Authentick Writings of the Apostles, and their own Epistles in their own style and Expressions. And supposing the Churches, to whom they were sent, to have received them as their Writings, and to have communicated them to others, as they did, I do not see, under these Circumstances, how a Book, containing Divine Revelations, could be lost.

Page 58. II. He Objects, *That the Canon of Scripture was not entire, but deficient for some hundreds of years, till the whole Canon was collected and acknowledged, and therefore so long the Church had no Perfect Rule of Faith.*

I Answer,

I. I distinguish between a Compleat Rule of Faith, and a Compleat Canon of Scripture. For, if the Books owned and universally received, contain in them all Matters of Faith, then the Rule of Faith is Compleat, although some particular Books may be still in Dispute. As for Instance, it is certain, that in St. *Jerom*'s Time, the Church of *Rome* did not receive as Canonical the Epistle to the *Hebrews*; Had not that Church therefore a Compleat Rule of Faith? If God hath so abundantly provided for his Church, that there may be a full Revelation of all Points of Faith in the rest, then the disputing the Authority of such an Epistle, doth not derogate from the Compleatness of the Rule of Faith.

Faith. For, if they have all Points of Faith, they muſt have a Compleat *Rule of Faith.*

II. It is no Prejudice to the true Canon of Scripture, that ſome particular Books of the *New Teſtament* were for ſome time diſputed by ſome particular Churches. For, if it were done without Ground, it doth reflect more on thoſe Churches than on thoſe Books; eſpecially when thoſe very Churches afterwards received them. And this was the Caſue of the Church of *Rome*, as to the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*: St. *Jerom* affirms, *That not onely the Greek Churches all received it, but all the Ancient Writers did ſo; and not meerly as an Eccleſiaſtical, but as a Canonical Epiſtle.* Therefore this muſt be a late thing in the Church of *Rome*; and in probability, began upon the *Novatian* Controverſie, which Epiſtle was thought too much to favour the *Novatian* Doctrine; and when that *Controverſie* did abate, that *Epiſtle* recovered its *Authority* in the Church of *Rome*. But Mr. *Serjeant* is angry with me, *for reflecting on the Church of* Rome *for not receiving the Epiſtle to the Hebrews in St.* Jerom's *Time*; *which* (he thinks) *was an Act of Prudence, antecedent to the Judgment or Determination of any Church, whether Greek or Latine.* One may ſee by this how well verſed he is in the Canon of Scripture, when St. *Jerom* declares, that not only all the Greek Writers received it, but all the Ancient, and that as *Canonical.* Was here no antecedent Judgment of the Church in this Matter? Doth not the Conſent of all Ancient Writers, even in St. *Jerom*'s Time, make a Judgment of the Church? But he adds, *That what I make a heinous Crime in the Church of* Rome, *was a commendable Caution in it.* That which I ſaid, was, That it hence appear'd, that the Church of *Rome* was far from being believed then to have the Authority of making the Canon of Scripture, or being Infallible in Faith. And what ſaith *J. Serjeant* in Anſwer to this? Not one Syllable, but runs it off to another thing.

*Hieronym. ad Dardanum.*

*Third Letter*, p. 57.

*But why do I not as well blame the Greek Churches for not receiving the Apocalypſe?* They do not pretend to ſuch Authority and Infallibility in in this Matter, as the Church of *Rome* doth. I do not deny that there were ſome Greeks then to blame in rejecting the Apocalypſe, but *Bellarmine* ſaith, they were but few and obſcure Perſons; and he produces the Teſtimonies of *Juſtin Martyr*, *Irenæus*, *Theophilus*, *Melito Sardenſis*, *Dionyſius Alexandrinus*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Origen* and *Athanaſius*, all approving it. And the Occaſion of diſputing it aroſe from the Millenary Opinion, which ſome thought they could not confute, as long as the Apocalypſe had ſuch Authority in the Church.

And ſuch Diſputes as theſe, which wore off by degrees, are no real Prejudice to the Canon of the *New Teſtament*, which was at firſt generally received; and although ſome few Books were conteſted for a time, yet they recover'd their Authority, and have ever ſince been received by the Univerſal Conſent of all Chriſtian Churches.

III. He objects againſt this univerſal Conſent, the *Teſtimonies of* Marcion, Ebion, Valentinus, Cerinthus, *and* Epiphanius *his other Hereticks, who rejected the Canon of the New Teſtament.* Could any Man but *J. Serjeant* make ſuch an Objection as this? But he had a Mind to bring me in as a Favourer of all Hereticks; and, as ſuch another Man of Integrity hath done, *of all Anti-Catholick and Anti-Chriſtian Doctrines.* But where have I given any Occaſion for ſuch ſpiteful Re-

*Third Letter*, p. 59.

flections? All that I said, was, We have the Universal Consent of all Christian Churches for the Canon of the *New Testament*, i. e. of all since the time that the Epistle to the *Hebrews* was receiv'd into the Latin, and the *Apocalypse* into the Greek Churches; notwithstanding all the Divisions they have since fallen into, yet they had no Difference as to the Canon of the *New Testament*. And this I insisted on as the Ground of our Certainty, *viz.* the unanimous Consent of all the great Bodies of Christians, that have continued under different Denominations to this Day.

Page 74. To this he gives no other Answer, *but that my Answer to the fifth Question, is co-incident with that to the fourth.* I thought *J. Serjeant*, in the self-evident way, would have liked my Answer the better for it: But he doth not comprehend the Design of it. I had said before, That we relied on the Universal Testimony of the Christian Church; upon that the Question was asked, What I meant by the Christian Church: My Answer was, *That it was that which was made up of all Christian Churches*; i. e. saith *J. Serjeant*, *That all the Parts make the Whole:* And what Incongruity is there? When Mr. *Godden* said, That the Christian Church may be taken in several Latitudes, he desired to know in what Sense I took it; and could I answer him more directly than to tell him, I took it in the largest Sense, as it was made up of all the Parts, and not in such a Sense as they do, who give the

Page 75. Denomination of the Whole to a Part? *But by this I do not seclude all Hereticks.* I do not take upon me to judge of all the Bodies of Christians in the World, whether they be justly charged with Heresy or not; but I take them only as Christians, and from their Universal Consent I prove the Certainty of the Canon of Scripture. *Hereby I profess a Brotherhood with excrementitious Outcasts.* I know not what *Brotherhood* lies in making use of their Testimony; but I had rather do it, than with unsufferable Pride and Folly call so many Bodies of Christians, for whom Christ died, *Excrementitious Outcasts.* But although

Page 76. he seems to own that their Testimony doth strengthen the Evidence for the Canon of the *New Testament*, yet he calls it back again, and for extraordinary Reasons. 1. *They may have corrupted the Letter of Scripture, although they may allow of the Books.* Let us then take their

Page 57. Testimony for the Books, and examine the Letter afterwards. 2. *This Universal Testimony must reach to each Chapter and Verse; but we must have Assurance not only of each Verse, but of each significant Word in the Verse.* How hardly are some Men satisfied about the Certainty of Scripture! Are there not different Copies in all Parts to examine and compare, if there be cause of Mistrust; and if there be none, What Prejudice is this to our Certainty? At this rate, Men may argue against every thing; and that there can be no Certainty of any Writing, unless the Person stood by, and saw the Author write; and even then he might question his Senses too. These Objections do indeed lead to an incu-

Page 76. rable Scepticism in the Church of *Rome*. 3. *The Judges suspect the Justness of the Cause, if known Knights of the Post are called in to corroborate the Evidence.* What a desperate Cause is that, which forces Men to fling such Dirt in the Face of so many Christian Churches? And that without the least Evidence or Proof against them. How come all the *Greek*, *Abyssine*, *Coptick*, *Oriental* Christians to be compared to *Knights of the Post*, because they afford a concurrent Testimony with us about the Canon of the *New Testament?* They may be the honest-

est

eſt and beſt Part of Chriſtendom for any thing *J. Serjeant* knows; and what Juſtice can there be in ſuch uncharitable Cenſures? It is not enough for you to ſay, they are all accounted Hereticks or Schiſmaticks by you; for we that know how unjuſt and unreaſonable your Cenſures are ſo near home, have no cauſe to regard them at ſuch a diſtance.

Thus I have anſwered all the Objections I have met with in *J. Serjeant* againſt our Rule of Faith.

I now come to the laſt part of my Task, which is to examine the Arguments produced to prove the *Infallibility* of *Oral* and *Practical Tradition.*

The main Argument is thus ſet down by Mr. *Serjeant*: *All Traditionary Chriſtians believe the ſame to Day which they did Yeſterday, and ſo up to the time of our Bleſſed Saviour*; *and if they follow this Rule, they can never err in Faith, and therefore are Infallible. And they could not innovate in Faith, unleſs they did forget what they held the Day before, or out of Malice after it.* First Letter, p. 8.

All the Parts of this Argument Mr. *Serjeant* endeavours to ſhew to be *ſelf-evident*; but in truth it is a *ſelf-evident Fallacy*, as I ſhall ſhew at large. But before I particularly lay it open, I muſt conſider what he ſaith againſt the Method I uſed in the Conference, for anſwering it.

I then thought and do ſtill, that the cleareſt Anſwer to an Argument, which proves a thing impoſſible, was to bring an undeniable Evidence that ſuch a thing really was which was proved impoſſible to be. And to this purpoſe I produced *the Inſtance of the Greek Church, which profeſſed to follow Tradition, and yet they could not deny to have erred.*

This Mr. *Serjeant* ſaith, *Is giving no Anſwer at all*; *for this is no Anſwer to his Argument, but producing a new Argument againſt him.* And he magiſterially tells me, *That it is my turn to anſwer*; *and therefore I am confined to* Concedo, Nego, *or* Diſtinguo, *as the Propoſitions are either true, falſe, or ambiguous*; *or I may deny the Inference, if I find more Terms in the Concluſion than in the Premiſes. But theſe are my Bounds, which I muſt not exceed.* But with Submiſſion to theſe Logicians, I anſwer, That where an Argument is deſigned to prove a thing impoſſible, which is contrary to Senſe and Experience, the producing an evident Inſtance is the plaineſt and ſhorteſt way of anſwering; as well as in an Induction, which is allowed to be diſproved by a plain Inſtance. As in the Caſe of *Zeno*'s Argument againſt Motion; *Diogenes* his moving was a far more effectual Anſwer, than if he had ſtood a great while with his *Concedo*, *Nego*, and *Diſtinguo*. *J. Serjeant* confeſſes, *That the Vanity of* Zeno's *Argument was not ill ridiculed by* Diogenes *his moving before him.* And why might not I then expoſe the Vanity of this Demonſtration by the Inſtance of the Greek Church, unleſs ſome Fault be found in the Inſtance. *He brings the Argument, and I an Inſtance againſt it, what are People the wiſer? And which ſhall they be for, the Argument or the Inſtance? Zeno* brought his Argument, and *Diogenes* his Inſtance; were not By-ſtanders the wiſer, when it ſo apparently proved the Foppery of the Argument? Doth *J. Serjeant* think the Vanity of it was not enough expoſed by that means? But he ſaith, *This is excepting againſt the Concluſion, when there lies none againſt the Premiſes.* No ſuch Matter; for it ſhews there is a Fallacy in the Premiſes. Page 18. Page 11.

Page 12. *It is however but an Argument*, ad hominem; call it what you will, ſo it doth my buſineſs, to ſhew the vanity of the Demonſtration. *This way doth but ſham an Adverſary.* And truly that is a great matter, if they be ſuch as *P. Godden. They are of no uſe for diſcovery of Truth.* As much as laying open Sophiſtry helps to the diſcovery of Truth; which is not a little when we deal with Sophiſtical Diſputers.

But we come to the *Inſtance.* How doth he after all clear this Inſtance of the Greek Church? Doth he deny that they hold to Tradition? No, Doth he deny that they have erred notwithſtanding? All

Page 13. that he ſaith is, That P. Godden *was no ways obliged not to deny that the Greek Church had erred in Points of Faith.* No? then he muſt grant that the Roman Church hath erred, for they contradict each other. Let him take his choice; one doth my buſineſs as well as the other, and more effectually deſtroys the pretence of Infallibility in the Roman Church. *But I ſay, they did not err.* What is my ſaying to the buſineſs in hand? Beſides, there are other Points contradictory held between the Greek and Roman Churches, beſides that of the *Filioque*, and the Argument holds as well in any other, as in that. And therefore he muſt fix the Error on one ſide or other.

After all this flouriſhing he takes heart, and reſolves to grapple with

Page 14. the Inſtance. *Let us ſee what your Inſtance will do.* Now I thought we ſhould have a direct Anſwer. But I am ſtrangely diſappointed. For he runs ſtill back to that, *That I do not believe it erred.* Was the Inſtance brought againſt me, or againſt *P. Godden*? *But his Anſwer doth not make or marr the buſineſs.* The buſineſs of the Demonſtration it doth,

Page 15. and that was my buſineſs. *But this doth not prove that a Church going upon Tradition errs, unleſs I will grant that the Greek Church hath erred.* What ſtrange Trifling is this? The Diſpute was about *P. Godden*'s Argument, and not my Opinion. Is this the Anſwer to the Inſtance about the Greek Church which Mr. *M.* promiſed? If this paſs for an Anſwer, I think *J. Serjeant* may defend *Sure footing.* I mentioned *P. Godden*'s Anſwer, *That the Greek Church followed Tradition till the* Arians *left the Rule, and took up a new one. And why ſaith* J. Serjeant *hath he not anſwered well?* Becauſe he did not anſwer to the purpoſe; which was not about the *Arians*, but the preſent Greek Church. *But a Church may follow Tradition at one time, and leave it at another.* Very true; but the Greek Church did not forſake Tradition, and yet erred. and therefore Tradition and Error were found together, and therein lies the force of this undeniable Inſtance. The reſt is ſuch Trifling, that I am really aſhamed to anſwer it over and over. Still he attempts to give an Anſwer, and ſtill fails; but it is ſomething new, and there-

Page 16. fore ſhall be conſidered. *His Anſwer*, ſaith *J. Serjeant holds as well to the preſent as paſt Greek Church.* His Anſwer! Where is it? *It was that thoſe who err in Faith muſt leave Tradition.* But the Greeks did not leave Tradition, and yet erred in Faith; ſo that the Inſtance holds good ſtill. *He denies that Error and Tradition can be found together in the Greek Church, or any other Ancient or Modern, i. e.* the Concluſion muſt be held againſt all the Inſtances in the World. *But I ought to ſay, whether the differences were in matters of Faith.* Yes, in ſuch which the Church of *Rome* accounts matters of Faith. *But how can an erring Church ſtill plead Tradition and adhere to it?* Anſwer the Inſtance; for the Greek Church doth plead Tradition. *But then pleading Tradition is no more but quoting ſome Expreſſions of ancient Writers, as the* Arians *did:* Not ſo neither;

for

for the Greek Church relies moſt upon Tradition from Father to Son in Practice, of any Church in the World. *But if they adhere to Tradition, and that Tradition leads them to Chriſt, who could not err, how can they poſſibly err? For, pray did Chriſt teach any Error?* No certainly. *When a Father believed what Chriſt taught him, and the Son what the Father believed, did not the Son too believe what Chriſt taught? Run it on to the laſt Son that ſhall be born in the World, muſt not every one believe what Chriſt taught, if every one believed what his Father believed?*

And ſo Goodnight to the Greek Church; we are come back to the Argument. *I might as well have Inſtanced in the Latin Church it ſelf.* Truly I think ſo too; and ſo you ſhall find in ſhort time; and how little Advantage you get by ſuch a Challenge. Page 19.

*But it is impoſſible for a Church to adhere to Tradition, and yet to Err; therefore if the priſent Grcek Church have Erred, it has not adhered to Tradition; if it have adhered to Tradition, it hath not Erred.* This is, the Argument muſt be good, let the Inſtance be what it will. But an eaſie Diſtinction will ſhew the Weakneſs of this Argument. Page 20.

*Adhering to Tradition* may be taken Two ways.

I. For adhering to Tradition, as the Rule and Means of Conveyance of Matters of Faith.

II. For actual Adhering to that very Doctrine which Chriſt taught, and hath ever ſince been truly convey'd down by Tradition.

In this latter Senſe we grant it impoſſible for Men to Err, while they actually adhere to that very Doctrine which Chriſt taught, and is ſuppoſed to be deliver'd down by Tradition. But this is not the Matter before us; which lies in theſe Two Points.

I. Whether Tradition be an Infallible Way to convey the Doctrine of Chriſt down to us.

II. Whether it be impoſſible for thoſe who hold to This as Their Rule, to Err or not.

And ſo the Anſwer is plain to the main Argument. If by *Traditionary Chriſtians*, be meant ſuch as adhere to that very Doctrine which Chriſt taught, and was actually conveyed down to them, then ſuch Traditionary Chriſtians, ſo believing, cannot Err.

But if by Traditionary Chriſtians be meant ſuch as take Tradition for an Infallible Rule of conveying all Matters of Faith; then we ſay ſuch Traditionary Chriſtians may and have Erred: And that for Two Reaſons.

I. Becauſe Tradition is no Infallible Rule.

II. Becauſe although it were, yet Men might Err, either by miſtaking it, or departing from it.

But ſaith *J. Serjeant They ceaſe to be Traditionary Chriſtians if they do not believe the ſame to Day which they did Yeſterday, and ſo up to Chriſt.* Page 8.

If by Traditionary Chriſtians be meant, they who do really believe what Chriſt taught, we grant it, that they are not.

If by *Traditionary Chriſtians* be meant ſuch as bear the Name of Traditionary Chriſtians, and look on Tradition as their Rule, and imagine they have the ſame Faith which Chriſt taught; then they are ſtill Traditionary Chriſtians.

And

And now I am to give a clear and distinct Answer to the *Demonstration* of the *Infallibility* of *Oral Tradition*, as it is managed by *J. Serjeant* and taken into Propositions.

I. *All Traditionary Christians believe the same to day which they did yesterday, and so up to the time of our Blessed Saviour.* J. Serjeant *hopes I have nothing to say to this*; but he is mistaken. For I have many things to say to lay open the Notorious Fallacy of it in every Clause.

I. *All Traditionary Christians.* Who are they? Are all *Christians Traditionary Christians?* This were to the purpose, if it could be proved. But how doth this appear? Why is it not said, *All Christians have gone upon this Principle?* He knows this could never have been proved. And therefore he puts in the thing in dispute, and would have it taken for granted, that there were no other but *Traditionary Christians.* Which I deny, and I am certain he can never prove it. Suppose then that there were *Christians* not *Traditionary* as well as *Traditionary*, the Proposition appears ridiculous; so far is it from Demonstration. *Traditionary Christians* believed so; *Non-Traditionary Christians* believed otherwise; and which are to be determined by the Certainty of the Ground they went upon; and so we are come to the Debate between *Scripture* and *Tradition.*

II. *All Traditionary Christians believe the same to Day which they did Yesterday.* This is capable of a threefold meaning.

I. That they do actually believe the same to Day which they did Yesterday. Which is a meer contingent thing, and proves nothing. Or,

II. That they are bound to believe to Day, as they did Yesterday. And that may be on several Accounts.

I. Because they see Evidence from the Word of God to Day as well as they did Yesterday.

II. Or because their Guides of the Church teach them the same to Day which they did Yesterday, whom they believe to be Infallible.

III. Or, meerly because they receive it by an *Oral Tradition*, and not on the other Accounts; and then it proves no more than that they are bound to do it; and it is too well known that many fail to do what they are *bound to.*

Or IV. That they do Infallibly believe the same to Day which they did Yesterday. But then this ought to have been inserted in the Proposition, That Traditionary Christians cannot fail to believe to Day what they did Yesterday. If it be said, *That this is implyed in their being Traditionary Christians*, then I say, the whole is a Fallacy of τὸ ἐν ἀρχῇ, for he supposes all true Christians to be *Traditionary Christians*, and then that they Infallibly dold to *Tradition* as their *Rule*, and from thence he proves *Tradition* to be *Infallible.* But if the Body of Christians may go upon another Rule, or if going upon Tradition, they may misunderstand it, then there is no inseparable connexion in the several Links of this Chain.

And there is a further Fallacy in supposing that if any Change in Faith happens, it must be as sudden and remarkable, as if all Men should *to day refuse to believe what they believed Yesterday.* Whereas the Changes of Opinions are oft-times wrought by insensible Degrees, and many

concurrent

concurrent Causes; and sometimes the very same Words may be used, and the Faith altered, as in the Case of *Merit*, *Sacraments*, *Sacrifice*, &c. which sheweth Men may continue the very same Terms, and yet believe quite a different thing. And where Changes are gradual, it is very unreasonable to pitch upon such a precise and narrow Space of time, as between *to Day* and *Yesterday*. By the same Method one may demonstrate it to be impossible that any Language should be changed; for People speak the same Language *to Day which they did Yesterday*, and the same *Yesterday which they did the Day before*, and so up to the very Building of *Babel*; and yet we all know that Languages are continually changed, and to such a degree, that in some Ages they cannot understand what was at that time intelligible by all. In such cases, it is enough to assign the general Causes and Reasons of Alterations, without fixing a precise and determinate Time. And those I shall speak to afterwards.

III. *And so up to the time of our Blessed Saviour.*
To prove any thing from hence it must be shewed,

I. That there can be no Pretence to Tradition taken up without Ground; for if there may, it can by no means follow, That if Men pretend to Tradition, that Tradition must run up to the Time of Christ.

*But then they cease to be Traditionary Christians.* What then? Not in pretence, for they may call themselves so still; but in reality they are not.

II. That if Men lay claim to a Rule, they must always observe it. We do not pretend to it as to the Scripture: And what Reason is there for it as to Tradition? But if Men may pretend to follow *Tradition*, and do not, then from their being *Traditionary Christians*, it can by no means follow that this Tradition must be carried up to the Time of our *Blessed Saviour*.

II. The second Proposition is, *And if they follow this Rule, they can never err in Faith. This is palpably self-evident*, saith *J. Serjeant*. So say I too, but it is onely to be a meer Fallacy.

*To follow this Rule is to believe the same to Day which they did Yesterday, and so up to Christ, or downwards: If they did this from Christ's time, and so forwards, they must continue to believe the same to the End of the World.*

If they *really believe* the same Doctrine which *Christ taught*, no doubt they cannot err. But the Question is, Whether this be an infallible Rule for us to judge, they could never mistake in this Rule, nor follow any other: For if either of these could happen, the Demonstration is lost. If it were possible for Error to come in some other way, or for Persons to misapprehend the Doctrine delivered, then it is not possible for us by this way to be convinced they could not err. The latter I have already spoken to; I shall now shew that there were some other ways that Errors might come in. And here I shall pass over the *common Infirmities* of *Human Nature*, which I think *Oral Tradition* can never cure, and which leave Men always liable to Error; but I shall name some more particular *Ways* of introducing them.

I. By

I. By the *Authority* of *False Teachers*. And for this I shall not run back to the *False Apostles* and *Seducers* in the *Apostles* times, and afterwards; but I shall bring a present Instance in the *Church* of *Rome*, and that is, of *Michael de Molinos*, a Person solemnly condemned at *Rome*, *Aug.* 28. of this Year, for 68 *Propositions* taken out of his Books, and owned by himself, *as the Decree saith*; which are there said to be *Heretical*, *Erroneous*, *Blasphemous*, *Offensive*, *Rash*, *Seditious*, *and contrary to Christian Discipline*. This Man is said to have had *Thousands* of *Disciples* in *Italy*, in the very Heart of the *Traditionary Church*. Now, I desire *J. Serjeant* to inform me, If *Tradition* be *Infallible*, and that be the way followed in the *Church* of *Rome*, how it was possible for such Multitudes to be deceived in Matters of such Consequence? To say they were not deceived, is to expose the Authority of the Guides of the Church of *Rome* to the greatest Contempt: To say they were deceived, is to own, That notwithstanding *Tradition*, a single Priest may gain such *Authority*, as to deceive *Thousands*; and where lies then the *Infallibility* of *Tradition*?

II. By *Enthusiasm*, or a Pretence to *Immediate Revelation*. For this I shall not produce the old Instances in *Ecclesiastical History*, as of *Montanus*, *Asclepiades*, *Theodotus*, *Manichæus*, *Arius*, *Ætius*, &c. who all pretended to Revelations for their particular Opinions. But I shall keep to the late Instance of *Molinos*, who asserts, That the Perfection of a Christian State lies in *simple*, *pure*, *infused and perfect Contemplation*, *above the Use of Ratiocination or discursive Prayer*, *and that in order to this*, *nothing is so necessary as Self-annihilation*. This Doctrine is now condemned at *Rome*; but how came it into the Church? *Did not they believe the same to Day which they did Yesterday?* If there were *Oral Tradition* for it, how came it to be condemned? If not, then notwithstanding *Oral Tradition*, dangerous Doctrines may get in, under a Pretence of a more *sublime* and *spiritual Way* of *Perfection*, than is to be attained in the dull and heavy way of *Tradition from Father to Son*.

*Euseb.* l. 5. c. 3. c. 14. c. 18. l. 7. c. 31. *Theod.* l. 1. c. 4. l. 2.

III. By a Pretence to a more *secret Tradition*, and thus *Christianity* was at first corrupted, by such as pretended that there was a *Mystical Doctrine* delivered by *Christ* of a more purifying Nature, than the plain and common Doctrine taught to all the People by the *Apostles*. So *Hegesippus* in *Eusebius* affirms, *That the Christian Church was corrupted by this Means*; and to the same Purpose *Irenæus*. So that *Tradition* was so far from securing the Church from *Error*, that it was the Means of bringing it in. And the *Publick Tradition* could not hinder this coming in of Error, because *secret Tradition* was pretended to be more Divine and Spiritual; the other was only for *Babes*, and this for *grown Christians*.

*Euseb.* l. 3. c. 32. l. 4. c. 22.

IV. By *Differences* among *Church-Guides* about the *Sense* of *Scripture* and *Tradition*. Thus it was in the *Samosatenian*, *Arian*, *Pelagian*, *Nestorian*, *and Eutychian Controversies*. Neither of these Parties denied *Scripture* or *Tradition*; and those who were justly condemned, pretended still to adhere to both. And if such Flames could not be prevented, so much nearer the *Apostles Times*, by the help of *Tradition*, what Reason can there be to expect it so long after?

V. By

V. By too great a *Veneration* to ſome particular Teachers not far from the Apoſtolical Times, in regard to their *Learning* or *Piety*; which made their Diſciples deſpiſe *Tradition* in Compariſon of their *Notions*. And thus *Origen*'s Opinions came to prevail ſo much in the Church; and the Mixture of *Platoniſm* with *Chriſtianity*, proved the Occaſion of ſeveral Errors, with Reſpect to the *State of Souls after Death*, as well as in other Points.

VI. By *Compliance* with ſome *Gentile Superſtitions*, in hopes to gain more eaſily upon the Minds of the People; who having been long accuſtomed to the *Worſhip* of *Images* and *Tutelar Deities*, it was thought no imprudent thing in ſome Guides of the *Church*, when the main Doctrines of *Paganiſm* were renounced, to humour the People in theſe things; ſo they were *accomodated* to *Chriſtianity*; but others vehemently oppoſed this Method, as repugnant to the true primitive Chriſtianity. But by degrees, thoſe *Superſtitions* prevailed, and the *Original Tradition* of the Church thereby corrupted.

VII. By *implicit Faith*, which puts it into the Power of the *Church-Guides* to introduce what Doctrines they thought fit. When the beſt of the People were told it was againſt the *Fundamental Rights of the Catholick Church* for them to examine any Opinions which were propoſed to them by their Guides, *That they neither did, nor could, nor ought to underſtand them*; and when once this Point was gained, People never troubled themſelves about *Scripture* or *Tradition*; for all they had to do, was only to know what was decreed by the Church, tho' with a *Non-obſtante* to a Divine Inſtitution, as is plain in the *Council* of *Conſtance*, notwithſtanding all the Tricks to avoid it.

If then Errors might come into the Church all theſe ways, what a vain thing is it to pretend, that *Oral Tradition* will keep from any poſſibility of Error?

And ſo I need give no other Anſwer to his laſt Propoſition, *That if Men did innovate in Faith, it muſt be either through Forgetfulneſs or Malice*; for I have ſhewed many *other Cauſes* beſides theſe; eſpecially ſince I intend to ſhew in a particular Diſcourſe, how the *Errors* and *Corruptions* we charge on the Church of *Rome* did come into it; my Deſign here being only to ſhew the *Poſſibility* of it.

There remain only two things which deſerve any Conſideration: 1. About the Charge of *Pelagianiſm*. 2. About the Council of *Trent*'s proceeding on *Tradition*, which will admit of an eaſy Diſpatch.

I. As to the Charge of *Pelagianiſm*. It doth not lie in this, *That he requires any rational Inducements to Faith*, which we do aſſert as well as he. But it lay in theſe two things.

I. That a *Divine Faith* was to be reſolved into a *Natural Infallibility*. For we were told that *Divine Faith muſt have Infallible Grounds*; and when we come to examine them, we find nothing but what is *Natural*. And now to avoid the Charge of *Pelagianiſm*, this *Divine Faith* is declared to be *meer Human Faith*; and ſo *Human Faith* is ſaid to have *Infallible Grounds*, but *Divine Faith* muſt ſhift for it ſelf. For ſaith *J. Serjeant*, 'Tis con- *Third Letter, Page, 24.*

 *feſs'd*

*fess'd and ever was, that the Humane Authority of the Church or Tradition, begets onely Humane Faith as its Immediate Effect; but by bringing it up to Christ, it leads us to what's Divine.* Well; but what *Infallible Ground* is there for this *Divine Faith?* Where doth that fix? Is it on the *Infallibility* of *Tradition* or not? If not, then we may have *Divine Faith* without it. If it doth, then *Divine Faith* is to be resolved into Natural Means: And what is this but *Pelagianism*?

*Faith Vindicated*, p. 155. Page 157.

II. *That he excludes the Pious Disposition of the Will, from piecing out* (as he calls it) *the Defect of the Reasons why we Believe.* And in another place he excludes the Will's Assistance in these words, *That Faith, or a Firm and Immoveable Assent upon Authority is not throughly Rational, and by consequence partly Faulty, if the Motives be not alone able to convince an Understanding rightly disposed without the Will's Assistance.* How then can a *pious Disposition* of the *Will* be necessary in order to the Act of Faith? And is it not *Pelagianism* to exclude it?

Page 27.

Therefore I was in the right, when I said, That this of *Oral Tradition* resolves all into a *meer Humane Faith*; and that this is the unavoidable Consequence of it. *No*, he saith, *he resolves all into Christ's and the Apostles teaching.* How ridiculous is this? For, did not *Pelagius* and *Cœlestius* the very same? And the thing I charged upon them, was, That they went no farther upon this Principle than they did. Upon this he asks a very impertinent Question; but if I do not Answer it, I know what Clamours will follow. *Pray do you hold that Christ is a meer Man, or that Believing him is a meer Humane Faith, or that the Doctrine taught by Him or Them is meerly Humane?* What Occasion have I given for such a Question? But I perceive there is a design among some, to make me be believed to be no Christian. I pray *God* forgive the *Malice* of such Men. I thank God, I have better Grounds for my *Faith* than *Oral Tradition.* I do believe Christ to be more than *meer Man*, even the *Eternal Son of God*, and that his *Doctrine* is *Divine*, and his *Apostles* had *Infallible Assistance* in delivering it. But what is all this to the present Question? I perceive some Men, when they are hard pinched, cry out, that their Adversaries are *Atheists* or *Socinians*, &c. and hope by this means to divert them from the business before them. But these Arts will not do. And such a Dust cannot so blind the Reader's Eyes, but he must see it is raised on purpose that he may not be discerned in making an Escape.

II. As to the *Council* of *Trent* proceeding upon *Tradition.* That which I said, was, The Church of *Rome* hath no where declared in Council, that it hath any such Power of making *Implicit Articles of Faith* contained in *Scripture* to become *Explicit* by its explaining the Sense of them. And the Reason I gave, was, Because the *Church* of *Rome* doth not pretend to make *New Articles of Faith:* But to make Implicit Doctrines to become Explicit, is really so to do; as I there proved. Now what saith *J. Serjeant* to this?

I. He saith, *That the Council of* Trent *defines it belongs to the Church to judge of the True Sense and Interpretation of Scripture.* As though all that belonged to the *Church*, must presently belong to the *Church* of *Rome*;

*Rome*; or all *Judgment* of *Scripture* muſt be *Infallible*; or muſt make things *neceſſary to be believed* which were not ſo before.

II. He ſhews, *That the Church did proceed upon this Power.* What *Power*? Of making things not Neceſſary to become Neceſſary?

I. *It declares* Seſſ. 13. *That from ſome Texts mentioned, the Church was ever perſuaded of the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation.* This is an admirable Argument, to prove that it can make that Neceſſary to be believed, which was not, becauſe it was always believed.

II. Seſſ. 14. *It declares* 1 Cor. 11. *to be underſtood of Sacramental Confeſſion, by the Cuſtom and Practice of the Church.* Then I ſuppoſe the Church thought it Neceſſary before.

III. Seſſ. 14. *It declares* Jam. 5. *to be underſtood of Sacramental Confeſſion.* But how? By its Power of making it Neceſſary to be believed meerly by ſuch Declaration? No; but by *Apoſtolical Tradition*; then the meaning is, that it was always ſo underſtood.

But becauſe the *Council* of *Trent* doth pretend to *Apoſtolical Tradition* for the Points there determin'd, and the ſhewing that it had not *Catholick* and *Apoſtolick Tradition*, is the moſt effectual Confutation of the preſent Pretence of *Oral Tradition*, I ſhall reſerve that to another Diſcourſe, part whereof, I hope, will ſuddenly be Publiſhed.

THE

# Council of Trent

EXAMIN'D and DISPROV'D

BY

## *CATHOLICK TRADITION,*

In the main Points in Controversy between Us and the CHURCH of ROME.

WITH

A Particular ACCOUNT of the Times and Occasions of introducing Them.

PART I.

To which a PREFACE is prefixed, concerning the true Sense of the Council of *Trent*, and the Notion of *Transubstantiation.*

# THE PREFACE.

THERE *is it ſeems a* Train *in* Controverſies, *as well as in* Thoughts; *one thing ſtill giving a ſtart to another*; Conferences *produce* Letters; Letters, Books, *and one* Diſcourſe *gives* Occaſion *for another. For this follows the former as a neceſſary* Purſuit *of the ſame Argument againſt* Tradition.

*J.* Serjeant *in his laſt* Letter, *had vouched the* Authority *of the* Council *of* Trent *proceeding upon* Tradition, *and he inſtanced in three Points*, Tranſubſtantiation, Sacramental Confeſſion *and* Extreme Unction. *The Examination of this I thought fit to reſerve for a* Diſcourſe *by it ſelf*; *wherein, inſtead of confining my Self to thoſe three Particulars, I intend to go through the moſt material Points there eſtabliſhed; and to prove, from the moſt Authentick Teſtimonies, that there was no* true Catholick Tradition *for any of them. And if I can make good what I have undertaken, I ſhall make the* Council *of* Trent *it* Self *the great Inſtance againſt the* Infallibility *of* Taadition. Third Letter, p. 64.

*This is a new Undertaking*; *which the Impetuouſneſs of our Adverſaries ſetting up* Tradition *for the Ground of their Faith, hath brought me to. But beſides the ſhewing that really they have not* Tradition *on their ſide*; *I have endeavoured to trace the ſeveral ſteps, and to ſet down the* Times *and* Occaſions *of Introducing thoſe Points which have cauſed that unhappy Breach in the Chriſtian Word, whoſe ſad Effects we daily ſee and lament*: *But have little hopes to ſee remedied, till theſe new Points be diſcarded, and Scripture, interpreted by truely* Catholick Tradition, *be made the Standard of Chriſtian Communion.*

*I do not pretend, that all theſe Points came in at one Time or in the ſame Manner*; *for ſome Errors and Corruptions came in far more early*; *ſome had the favour of the* Church *of* Rome *in a higher degree*; *ſome were more generally received in the Practice of the Church in latter times, than others*; *and ſome were merely* School Points *before the Council of* Trent; *but as far as the* Thomiſts *and* Scotiſts *could be made to agree there againſt the Reformers, theſe paſſed*

*paſſed for* Articles *of* Faith. *For, this was one of the great Arts of that* Council *to draw up their* Decrees *in ſuch Terms, as ſhould leave Room enough for Eternal Wranglings among themſelves, provided they agreed in doing the buſineſs effectually againſt the* Hereticks, *as they were pleaſed to call them. I therefore forbear to urge theſe as* Points *of* Faith, *which have been freely debated among themſelves ſince the* Council *of* Trent, *without any Cenſure. We have enough, in the plain* Decrees *and* Canons *of that* Council, *without meddling with any* School-Points. *And ſo I cannot be charged with* Miſrepreſenting.

*The great Debate of late hath been about the* true Expoſition *of the* Points *there defined; and for my part, I am content to yield to any juſt and reaſonable Methods of giving the* true Senſe *of them. And ſuch I conceive theſe to be.*

I. *Where the* Council *of* Trent *makes uſe of Words in a* ſtrict *and* limited Senſe, *there it is unreaſonable to underſtand them in a* large *and* improper Senſe. *As for inſtance,* Seſſ. 6. *c.* 26. *It decrees that Juſtified Perſons do* verè promerere, *truely merit Eternal Life: and* Can. 32. *there is an* Anathema *againſt him who denies* true Merit in the good Works of juſtified Perſons, both as to Increaſe of Grace and Eternal Life. *There is no one converſant in Ancient Writers, but knows that there was a large and improper Senſe of the Word* Merit; *but how is it poſſible to apply that Senſe, where ſuch Care is taken, that it may be underſtood in a ſtrict and limited Senſe? If the Council had left the Word in its General Senſe, there might have been Reaſon to have given the faireſt Interpretation to it; but when it is certainly known, that there had been a difference of Opinions in the* Church *of* Rome *about* true and proper Merit, *and that which was not (however it were called,) and the* Council *declares from the former, no Man of underſtanding can believe that onely the* improper Senſe *was meant by it. As in the Point of the* Euchariſt, *when the* Council *declares that the Words of Chriſt,* This is my Body, *are* truely and properly *to be underſtood; Would it not be thought ſtrange for any one to ſay, that the* Council *notwithſtanding might mean that Chriſt's Words may be figuratively underſtood; And we muſt take the* true notion *of Merit not from any large expreſſions of the Ancients, but from the Conditions of* true and proper Merit *among themſelves. But of this at large afterwards. So as to the Notion of* Sacraments; *every one knows how largely that Word was taken in Ancient Writers; but it would be abſurd to underſtand the* Council *of* Trent *in that Senſe, when* Seſſ. 6. Can. 1. De Sacramentis, *it denounces an* Anathema

*not*

*not merely againſt him* that denies ſeven Sacraments, *but againſt him* that doth not hold every one of them to be truely and properly a Sacrament. *And in the* Creed *of* Pius IV. *one Article is, that there are* ſeven true and proper Sacraments. *How vain a thing then were it for any to expound theſe* Sacraments *in a large and improper Senſe?*

II. *Where the* Council *of* Trent *hath not declared it ſelf, but it is fully done in the* Catechiſm *made by its Appointment, we ought to look on that as the* true Senſe *of the* Council. *As in the Caſe of the* Sacraments; *the* Council *never declares what it means by* true and proper Sacraments, *but the* Catechiſm *makes large and full amends for this Defect. For after it hath mention'd the uſe of the Word in profane and ſacred Writers, it ſets down the Senſe of it according to their Divines, for* a ſenſible Sign which conveys the Grace which it ſignifies. *And after a large Explication of the Nature of Signs, it gives this Deſcription of a true and proper Sacrament,* That it is a ſenſible thing, which by Divine Inſtitution not only hath the Force of ſignifying, but of cauſing Grace. *And to ſhew the Authority of this* Catechiſm *for explicating the* Doctrine *of the* Sacraments, *we need only to look into* Seſſ. 24. c. 7. de Reform. Where it is required that the People be inſtructed in the Sacraments according to it. *It is ſuppoſed, that the* Catechiſm *was appointed to be made in the* 18th Seſſion, *at the Inſtigation of* Carolus Borromæus *(ſince* Canonized*) but it was not finiſhed while the* Council *ſat, and therefore* Seſſ. 25. it was refer'd to the Judgment and Authority of the Pope. *I confeſs therefore it hath not a* Conciliar Authority *ſtamped upon it, but it hath a ſort of* transfuſed Infallibility, *as far as they could convey it; and as much as a* Council *hath, when it borrows it from the* Pope's Confirmation. *It was near two Years hammering at* Trent, viz. *from* 26th *of* Feb. 1562. *to* Decemb. 1563. *when the* Council *roſe; afterwards it was preparing at* Rome *three Years longer, and then preſented to the* Pope *to be approved, and publiſhed by his Authority, after it had been carefully review'd by* Cardinal Sirlet, Borromæo, *and others, and hath ſince been univerſally received in the* Roman Church; *ſo that we can have no more authentick* Expoſition *of the* Senſe *of the* Council *of* Trent, *than what is contained in that* Catechiſm. Catechiſm Rom. Part 2.

III. *Where the* Council *of* Trent *declares a thing in general to be* lawful *and* due, *but doth not expreſs the* manner *of it, that is to be underſtood from the generally receiv'd and allow'd Practices at that time. For otherwiſe the* Council *muſt be charged with great*

*Unfaithfulness, in not setting down and correcting publick and notorious Abuses, when it mention'd the things themselves, and some Abuses about them. As in the* 25th Session, *concerning* Purgatory, Invocation of Saints, Worship of Images *and* Relicks, *it goes no farther than* the sound Doctrine be taught, that Saints are to be Invocated, Images and Relicks to be Worship'd; *but never defines what* that sound Doctrine *is, what* Bounds *are to be set in the Worship of* Saints, Images *and* Relicks, *which it is unlawful to exceed. So that in this Case we have no other way to judge of the Meaning of the Council, but by comparing the* publick and allow'd Practices *of the* Church *with the General* Decrees *of the* Council. *And we have this farther Reason for it, that we are told by the latest Expositors of it, that the Sense of the* Church *in* speculative Points, *is to be taken from* Publick Practices. *For thus one of them expresses himself*: Moreover, even her Speculative Doctrines are so mixed with Practical Ceremonies, which represent them to the Vulgar, and instruct even the meanest Capacities in the abstrusest Doctrines, that it seems ever impossible to make an Alteration in her Doctrine without abrogating her Ceremonies, or changing her constant Practices.

Reply to the Defence of the Exposition, &c. p. 134.

IV. *Where the Decrees of the Council are not sufficiently clear, there we must take in the* Canons *to make the* Sense *more plain. This* Rule *I take from the* Council *it self, which in the* 6th Session, *just before the* Canons, *saith*, That those are added, that all may know not only what they are to hold and follow, but what they are to shun and avoid. *As in the famous Instance of* Transubstantiation; *suppose that the Words of the* Decree *do not determine expresly the* Modus, *yet it is impossible for any one to doubt of it who looks into the* Canon, *which denounces an* Anathema *against him, not only that* denies Transubstantiation, *but that* asserts the Subsstance of Bread and Wine to remain after Consecration. *Therefore he that asserts* Transubstantiation, *according to the* Council *of* Trent, *must hold it in such a* manner, *as thereby to understand* that the Subsstance of Bread and Wine doth not remain. *Otherwise he is under an* Anathema, *by the express* Canon *of the Council.*

Sess. 13. Can. 2.

*Therefore it is so far from being a* fatal Oversight (*as a late Author expresses it*) to say that the Council of *Trent* hath determin'd the Modus of the Real Presence, *that no Man who is not resolved to* oversee it, *can be of another Opinion. And herein the* Divines *of the Church of* Rome *do agree with us*, viz. *that the particular* Modus *is not only determin'd by the* Council, *but that it is a*

Matter

Matter *of* Faith *to all Persons of the Communion of that Church. As not only appears from the* 2d Canon, *but from the very* Decree *it self*, Sess. 13. ch. 4.

The holy Synod declares, that by Consecration of the Bread and Wine, there is a Conversion of the whole Substance of the Bread into the Substance of the Body of Christ, and of the whole Substance of the Wine into the Substance of his Blood, which Conversion is fitly and properly by the holy Catholick Church called Transubstantiation. *In which Words the* Council *doth plainly express the* Modus *of the* Real Presence *to be, not by a Presence of* Christ's Body *together with the* Substance of the Bread, *as the* Lutherans *held, but by a* Conversion of the whole Substance of the Bread into the Substance of the Body, &c. *And since there were different* Manners *of understanding this* Real Presence, *if the* Council *did not Espouse one so as to reject the other as* Heretical; *then it is impossible to make the* Lutheran *Doctrine to be declared to be* Heretical, *i. e. unless the* Council *did determine the* Modus *of the* Real Presence. *For, if it did not, then notwithstanding the* Decrees *and* Canons *of the* Council *of* Trent, *Persons are at liberty to believe either* Transubstantiation *or* Consubstantiation, *wich I think no* Roman Catholick *will allow.*

*But it is said, that the meaning of the* Decree *is,* that the Real Presence is not to be understood after a Natural, but a Sacramental Manner; *But doth it not plainly tell us, how that* Sacramental Manner *is to be understood,* viz. by a Conversion of the whole Substance of the Bread into the whole Substance of the Body, &c. *And if other ways be possible, and all others be rejected, then this particular* Modus *must be determin'd.*

*I grant that the* Council *doth not say,* there is an Annihilation of the Elements; *and I know no Necessity of using that Term, for that which is supposed to be turned into another thing cannot properly be said to be* Annihilated (*which is the reducing it to nothing*) *but the* Council *doth assert* a Total Conversion of one Substance into another, *and where that is, that* Substance *must wholly cease to be what it was; and so, there can be no Substance of the Elements remaining after Consecration. For, as* Aquinas *observes,* Quod convertitur in aliquid factâ Conversione non manet. *If then the* Substance *of the Elements doth not remain after Consecration, by virtue of this* total Conversion, *then the* Council *of* Trent, *by its* Decree, *hath plainly determin'd the* Modus *of the* Real Presence, *so as to exclude any such* Manner, *as doth suppose, the* Substance *to remain, whether it be by* Impanation *or* Consubstantiation, *or any other way.* 3 Q. 75. A. 2.

*What* if *Rupertus* thought the Bread might become the Real Body of Christ by an Union of the Word to it? *All that can be inferr'd is, that the* Modus *was not then so determin'd, as to oblige all Persons to hold it. But what is this to the* Council *of* Trent? *Can any one hold the* Substance *to remain, and not to remain at the same time? For, he that holds with* Rupertus *must allow the Substance to remain; he that believes a total Conversion must deny it. And he that can believe both these at once, may believe what he pleases.*

But the Council only declares the Sacramental Presence to be after an ineffable manner. *I say, it determines it to be by* a total Conversion of one Substance into another; *which may well be said to be* ineffable, *since what cannot be understood can never be expressed.*

*Our Dispute is not about the use of the Word,* Transubstantiation, *for I think it proper enough to express the Sense of the* Council *of* Trent; *but as the Word* Consubstantial *did exclude all other* Modes *how Christ might be* the Son of God, *and determin'd the Faith of the Church to that* Manner; *so doth the Sense of* Transubstantiation, *as determin'd by the Council of* Trent, *limit the* Manner *of the* Real Presence, *to such a* Conversion *of the* Substance *of the Elements into the* Substance of Christ's Body and Blood, *as doth imply no Substance to remain after Consecration.*

*It is to no purpose to tell us,* the Council uses onely the Word Species and not Accidents; *for whatever they are called, the* Council *denounces its* Anathema *against those* who held the Substance to remain after the Consecration; and denies the Total Conversion of the Substance of the Bread and Wine into Substance of the Body and Blood of Christ. *If the* Substance *be not there, the* Modus *is to purpose determin'd. And whatever remains, call it what you will, it is not the* Substance; *and that is sufficient to shew, that the* Council *of* Trent *hath clearly determin'd the* Modus *of the* Real Presence.

V. *We must distinguish the* School-Points *left undetermin'd by the* Council *of* Trent, *from those which are made* Articles *of* Faith. *We never pretend, that it left no* School-Disputes *about the Points there determin'd; but we say it went too far in making some* School-Points *to be Points of Faith, when it had been more for the Peace of Christendom to have left them to the* Schools *still. Thus in the Point of* Transubstantiation, *the elder* School-men *tell us, there were different Ways of explaining the* Real Presence; *And that those, which supposed the Substance to remain,* were more agreeable to Reason and Scripture than the other; *and some were of Opinion,* that the

*Modus*

*Modus* was no matter of Faith then. *But after the Point of the* Real Presence *came to be warmly contested, in the time of* Berengarius, *it rose by degrees higher and higher, till at last the particular* Modus *came to be determined with an* Anathema *by the* Council *of* Trent.

*When* Berengarius, *A. D.* 1059. *was forced to Recant by* Nicolaus II. *with the Assistance of* 113 *Bishops; no more was required of him,* than to hold that the Bread and Wine after Consecration, are not only the Sacrament, but the true Body and Blood of Christ, and that it is sensibly handled and broke by the Priests hands, and eaten by the Communicants. *Here is no denying the* Substance *of* Bread *to remain; and* Joh. Parisiensis *observes, that the words cannot be defended but by an* Assumption *of the Bread; For, saith he,* If the Body of Christ be truely and sensibly handled and eaten, this cannot be understood of Christ's Glorious Body in Heaven, but it must be of the Bread really made the Body of Christ after Consecration.

*The Sense which the* Canonists *put upon the Words of this* Recantation *is absurd,* viz. that they are to be understood of the Species; *For* Berengarius *his Opinion related to the* Substance of Christ's Body *which he denied to be in the Sacrament. And what would it have signified for him to have said* that Christ was sensibly broken and eaten under the Species of Bread and Wine? *i. e. that his Body was not sensibly broken and eaten, but the* Species *were. It had signified something, if he had said,* there was no Substance of Bread and Wine left but onely the Species. *But all the design of this Recantation was to make him assert the* Sacrament to be made the true and Real Body of Christ, *in as strong a manner, as the Pope and his Brethren could think of. And although the* Canonists *think,* if strictly *taken,* it implies greater Heresie than that of Berengarius; *yet by their favour, this Form was only thought fit to be put into the* Canon-Law, *as the Standard of the Faith of the* Roman Church *then; and the following* Adjuration *of* Berengarius *was only kept in the* Register *of* Gregory the seventh's Epistle.

*For about twenty years after, by Order of* Gregory the VII. Berengarius *was brought to another* Adjuration, *but by no means* after the same Form with the former. *For by this he was required to declare,* that the Bread and Wine are substantially Converted into the true and proper Flesh and Blood of Christ, and after Consecration are the true Body of Christ born of the Virgin and Sacrificed upon the Cross, and that sits at the right hand of the Father; and the true Blood of Christ which was shed out of his Side, not onely as a Sacramental Sign, but in propriety of Nature and Reality of Substance. *This*

*This was indeed* a pretty bold Assertion of the Substantial Presence. *And so much the bolder, if the* Commentary *on S.* Matthew *be* Hildebrand's. *For there he saith,* the manner of the Conversion is uncertain. *But, as far as I can judge, by* Substantial Conversion *he did not then mean, as the* Council *of* Trent *doth,* a total Conversion of one Substance into another, so as that nothing of the former Substance remains; *but* that there was a Change by Consecration, not by making the Body of Christ of the Substance of the Bread, but by its passing into that Body of Christ which was born of the Virgin. *For, upon comparing the two Forms, there we shall find lies the main difference. Pope* Nicolaus *went on farther than to* the true Body of Christ; *which it might be as well by* Assumption, *as* Conversion; Gregory VII. *went farther, and thought it necessary to add that the Change was into the* Substance of that Body which was born of the Virgin, *&c. And so this second Form excludes a true Body merely by* Assumption, *and asserts the Change to be* into the Substance of Christ's Body in Heaven; *but it doth not determine, that nothing of the* Substance *of the* Elements *doth remain. For when he puts* that kind of Substantial Conversion which leaves nothing but the Accidents, and the Body of Christ to be under them, which belonged to the Substance of the Elements; *he declares* this matter to be uncertain. *Which shews, that however a* Change *was owned into the* Substance *of* Christ's Body, *yet such a* total Conversion, *as is determined by the* Council *of* Trent, *was not then made an Article of Faith.*

*But from this supposition made by* Hildebrand *it appears, that the Doctrine of* Substance *and* Accidents *was then well known; and therefore the introducing* Aristotle's Philosophy *from the* Arabians *afterwards could make no Alteration in this Matter. For the words of* Hildebrand *are as plain, as to the difference of* Substance *and* Accidents, *as of any of the* School-men; *and that the* Accidents *of the Bread and Wine might be separated from the Substance of them; but this was not then made a Matter of Faith; as it was afterwards.*

*But the case was remarkably alter'd, after the* Lateran Council *under* Innocent *III. For* Transubstantiation *being admitted there among the* Articles *of* Faith; *and so entered in the* Canon Law *in the very beginning of the* Decretals; *this did not merely become a* School-Term, *but by the* Inquisitors *of that time, it was accounted* Heresie *to deny it. It may be sufficiently proved by the* School-men *and* Canonists, *that a difference of* Opinions, *as to the* Modus *did still continue, (but that belongs to a more proper place) and* Joh. Parisiensis *declares* (p. 103.) that the Lateran Council, in his Opinion,

Opinion did not make Tranſubſtantiation a Point of Faith; or at leaſt that Subſtance was not to be taken for the Matter, but the Suppoſitum; *but the* Inquiſitors *went more briskly to work and made it downright* Hereſie *to aſſert*, that the Subſtance of the Elements did remain after Conſecration.

*Of this, we have full Evidence in the* Regiſter *of* Courtney Archbiſhop *of* Canterbury, (*which is* no Inviſible Manuſcript.) *For there we read*, f. 25. *that he called a ſelect* Convocation *of* Biſhops, Divines *and* Canoniſts, May 17. *A. D.* 1382. *to declare ſome Propoſitions to be* Heretical, *and ſome to be* Erroneus *and* contrary to the determination of the Church. *Among the firſt, two are ſet down in the firſt Place,*

1. That the material Subſtance of the Bread and Wine doth remain in the Sacrament of the Altar, after Conſecration.

2. That the Accidents do not remain without their Subject in that Sacrament after Conſecration.

*After this the* Archbiſhop *ſent forth his Mandate to all his* Suffragans *not only to prohibit the preaching of that Doctrine, but to inquire after thoſe who did it. And June* 12. Robert Rygge Chancellour *of* Oxford *and* Thomas Brightwall *appeared before him, and were examined upon theſe Propoſitions; which they declared to be* Heretical: *who thereupon required the Publication of them as ſuch in the* Univerſity; *and the proceeding againſt thoſe who were ſuſpected to favour them.*

*The Ground the* Archbiſhop *went upon, was*, that theſe had been already condemned by the Church, *and therefore* ex abundanti, they declared them to be ſo condemned; *as appears by the* Monition *given to* Robert Rygge *himſelf as too much ſuſpected to favour the contrary Doctrine; as well as* Nicholas Hereford, Philip Reppyndon *D. D and* John Aſhton *B. D.*

*Againſt theſe the* Archbiſhop *proceeded as* Inquiſitor Hæreticæ Pravitatis per totam ſuam Provinciam, *as it is in the* Record; *who appearing deſired a Copy of the ſeveral* Propoſitions, *and then they were required to give in their judgment upon them.* Aſhton *refuſed, but the other promiſed, which they performed ſoon after; and to theſe two Propoſitions, their Anſwers were,*

To the firſt, that as far as it was contrary to the Decretal, *Firmiter Credimus*, it was Hereſie.

*To the ſecond*, that as far as it was contrary to the Decretal *Cum Marthæ*, it was Hereſie.

*Theſe Anſwers were judged* inſufficient, *becauſe they did not declare what the* Senſe *was. And the* Archbiſhop *put this Queſtion*

*to*

*to them*, whether the ſame Numerical material Bread which before Conſecration was ſet upon the Altar, did remain in its proper Subſtance and Nature after Conſecration, *but they would give no other Anſwer at that time. But afterwards* Reppyndon *abjured, and was made* Biſhop *of* Lincoln.

*From hence it appears, that it was then thought that the* Modus *was ſo far determin'd by the* Lateran Council, *that the* contrary Doctrine was *declared not merely* Erroneous in Faith, *but* Heretical.

*In the firſt* Convocation *held by* Th. Arundel Archbiſhop *of* Canterbury *A. D.* 1396. *A Complaint was brought, that ſeveral* Divines *and others of the* Univerſity *of* Oxford *held ſome* Heretical *and* Erroneous *opinions; the firſt whereof was,* Regiſt. f. 47.

That the Subſtance of Bread doth remain after Conſecration; and doth not ceaſe to be Bread; *which is there affirmed* to be Hereſie, ſpeaking of material Bread.

*The ſecond*, that the Court of Rome in the *Can. Ego* Berengarius, had determined that the Sacrament of the Euchariſt is naturally true Bread.

*It is very hard to ſay, how this came to be then accounted Heretical Doctrine, when no leſs a Man than* Durandus *in the ſame Age affirms*, that the Canoniſts grant that the Opinion of the ceaſing of the Subſtance was grounded on the *Can.* Firmiter Credimus *i. e. on the* Lateran Council; but that of the remaining of the Subſtance on that, *Ego* Berengarius. *But however it paſſed for* Heretical, *or at leaſt very* Erroneous *Doctrine here; but the main* Hereſie *was to hold*, that the Subſtance remained.

*For* A. D. 1400. *(as appears by the* Regiſter *p.* 2 *f.* 179.) William Sawtre, *alias* Chatris, *a Parochial Prieſt in* London, *was ſummoned before the ſame* Archbiſhop *in* Convocation *upon an Information of* Hereſie; *and one of the main Articles againſt him was, that he held* the Subſtance of the Bread to remain in the Sacrament of the Altar after Conſecration; and that it doth not ceaſe to be Bread. Sawtre *anſwered, that he believed*, that after Conſecration the Bread did remain with the Body of Chriſt; but it doth not ceaſe to be ſimply Bread, but it remains holy and true the Bread of Life and Body of Chriſt. *The* Archbiſhop *examined him chiefly upon this Article; and becauſe he did not anſwer home to the point, he was condemned for a* Heretick, *and was the firſt who was burned for* Hereſie *in* England. *And yet his Anſwer was* that he could not underſtand the matter; *then the* Archbiſhop *asked him*, if he would ſtand to the Church's Determination;

*he*

*he said*, He would so far as it was not contrary to the Word of God. *Upon which he was declared an Heretick, and delivered over to the Secular Power.*

*In the same Convocation*, John Pervey *made an* Abjuration *of* Heresy, *and the first he renounced, was*, That after Consecration in the Sacrament of the Altar, there neither is, nor can be an Accident without a Subject, and that the same Substance and Nature of Bread remained which was before.

*In the* Examination *of* William Thorp, *by* Thomas Arundel, Archbishop *of* Canterbury, *A. D.* 1407. (*which is not in the* Register, *being defective, but the Account is preserved from his own Copy*) *the* Archbishop *declared*, That the Church had now determined, that there abideth no Substance of Bread after Consecration in the Sacrament of the Altar. And that if he believed otherwise, he did not believe as the Church believed. Thorp *quoted St.* Augustin *and* Fulgentius, *to prove* that the Substance remained, and the very Mass on Christmas-Day. *The* Archbishop *still pressed him with the* Church's Determination. Thorp *said*, this was a School-Nicety, whether Accidents could be without a Subject; *no, said the* Archbishop, it is the Faith of the Church I go upon. Thorp *replyed*, It was not so for a thousand Years after Christ.

*In the Examination of the* Lord Cobham, *A. D.* 1412. *by the same* Archbishop, *we find that he owned* the Real Presence of Christ's Body *as firmly as his Accusers; but he was condemned for* Heresy, because he held the Substance of Bread to remain. *For the* Archbishop *declared this to be the Sense of the* Church, That after Consecration, remaineth no material Bread or Wine which were before, they being turned in Christ's very Body and Blood. *The Original Words of the* Archbishop, *as they are in the Register, are these.* Regist. *Arundel*, p. 2. f. 143.

**The Faith and the Determination of holy Church, touching the blessfull Sacrament of the Auter is this, that after the Sacramental Words ben said by a Prest in his Masse, the material Bred that was before is turned into Christ's veray Body. And the material Wyn that was before, is turned into Christ veray Blode, and so there leweth in the Auter, no material Brede ne material Wyn the wich wer ther byfore the saying of the Sacramental Words.**

*And the* Bishops *afterwards stood up and said*, It is manifest Heresy to say that it is Bread after the Sacramental Words be spoken; because it was against the Determination of holy Church.

*But to make all ſure, not many Years after*, May 4*th*, *A.D.* 1415. *the* Council *of* Conſtance, *Seſſion* 8. *declared the two* Propoſitions *before mentioned to be* heretical, *viz.* to hold that the Subſtance doth remain after Conſecration, and that the Accidents do not remain without a Subject.

*Let any impartial Reader judge whether it be any* fatal Overſight *to aſſert*, that the Modus of the Real Preſence was determin'd by the Council of *Trent*, *when there were ſo many leading Determinations to it*, *which were generally owned and received in the* Church *of* Rome. *But there were other* Diſputes *remaining in the* Schools *relating to this* Matter; *which we do not pretend were ever determin'd by the* Council *of* Trent. *As*,

(1.) *Whether the Words of* Conſecration *are to be underſtood in a* Speculative *or* Practical Senſe? *For the* Scotiſts *ſay*, *in the former Senſe they do by no means prove* Tranſubſtantiation, *ſince it may be truly ſaid* This is my Body, *though the Subſtance of Bread do remain*, *and that they are to be underſtood in* a Practical Senſe; *i. e. for converting the Bread into the Body*, *is not to be deduced* ex vi verborum, *from the mere Force of the Words*, *but from the Senſe of the Church which hath ſo underſtood them*: *Which in plain terms is to ſay*, *it cannot be proved from* Scripture, *but from the Senſe of the Church*; *and ſo* Scotus *doth acknowledge*, *but then he adds*, that we are to judge this to be the Senſe of Scripture, becauſe the Church hath declared it. Which he doth not think was done before the Council of *Lateran*. *So that this Council muſt be believed to have had as Infallible a Spirit in giving this Senſe of* Scripture, *as there was in the writing of it*; *ſince it is not drawn from the Words*, *but added to them*. *On the other ſide*, *the* Thomiſts *inſiſt on the Force of the Words themſelves*; *for if*, *ſay they*, *from the Words be infer'd that there is a Real Preſence of the Subſtance of Chriſt's Body*, *then it follows thence*, *that there is no Subſtance of the Bread remaining*; *for a Subſtance cannot be where it was not before*, *but it muſt either change its Place*, *or another muſt be turned into it*; *as Fire in a Houſe muſt either be brought thither*, *or ſome other thing muſt be turned into Fire*: *But*, *ſay they*, *the Body of Chriſt cannot be brought from Heaven thither*, *for then it muſt leave the Place it had there*, *and muſt paſs through all the Bodies between*; *and it is impoſſible for the ſame Body to be locally preſent in ſeveral Places*; *and therefore the Body of Chriſt cannot otherwiſe be really and ſubſtantially preſent*, *but by the Converſion of the Subſtance of the Bread into it*.

(2.) *In*

(2.) *In what* Manner *the* Body of Christ *is made to be present in the Sacrament? The* Scotists *say it is impossible to conceive it otherwise than by bringing it from the Place where it already is; the* Thomists *say that is impossible, since that Body must be divided from it self by so many other Bodies interposing. The former is said to be an* adductive *Conversion, the latter a* productive; *but then here lies another Difficulty, how there can be a productive Conversion of a thing already in being. But my Business is not to give an account of these* School-Disputes; *but to shew how different they were from the Point of* Transubstantiation; *and that both these disputing Parties did agree that the* Modus *of the* Real Presence *was defined to be* by changing the Substance of the Elements into the Body and Blood of Christ, *but they still warmly disputed about the* Modus *of that* Modus; *viz. how a Body already in Being could be present in so many Places, without leaving that Place where it was already. And no Man, who hath ever look'd into these* School-Disputes, *can ever imagine that they disputed about the Truth of the Doctrine of* Transubstantiation, *but only about the* manner *of explaining it. Wherein they do effectually overthrow each others Notions, without being able to establish their own; as the* Elector *of* Cologn *truly observed of their Debates about this Matter in the* Council *of* Trent.

VI. *Where the Sense of Words hath been changed by the introducing new Doctrines, there the Words ought to be understood according to the Doctrine at that time received. Of this we have two very remarkable Instances in the* Council *of* Trent.

*The first is about* Indulgences, *which that* Council *in its last* Session *never went about to define, but made use of the old Word, and so declares both Scripture and Antiquity for the use of them. But there had been a mighty Change in the Doctrine about them, since the Word was used in the Christian Church. No doubt there was a Power in the Church to relax* Canonical Penances *in extraordinary Cases; but what could that signify, when the* Canonical Discipline *was laid aside, and a new Method of dealing with Penitents was taken up, and another Trade driven with respect to* Purgatory Pains? *For here was a new thing carried on under an old Name. And that hath been the great Artifice of the* Roman Church, *where it hath evidently gone off from the* old Doctrines, *yet to retain the* old Names, *that the unwary might still think the Things were the same, because the Names were. As in the present Case; We deny not the use of* Indulgences *in the* Primitive Church, *as the Word was used for* Relaxations *of the* Canonical Discipline; *but we utterly deny it*

*as to the* Pains *of* Purgatory. *And that this was the Sense then receiv'd in the Church of* Rome, *appears from the Papal Constitutions of* Boniface VIII. Clemens VI. *and* Leo X. *But of these more hereafter.*

*The other Instance is in the Word* Species *used by the* Council *of* Trent, Sess. 13. Can. 2. *where* an Anathema is denounced against him that denies the Conversion of the whole Substance of the Elements into the Body and Blood of Christ, the Species of Bread and Wine only remaining. *Now a Controversy hath been started in the* Church *of* Rome, *what is to be understood by* Species, *whether* real Accidents, *or only* Appearances.

*Some of the* Church *of* Rome, *who have had a Taste of the new Philosophy, reject any* real Accidents, *and yet declare* Transubstantiation *to be a Matter of Faith, and go about to explain the Notion of it in another manner. Among these one* Emanuel Maignan, *a Professor of Divinity at* Tholouse, *hath at large undertaken this Matter. The Method he takes is this:*

*Maignan* Philosophia Sacra, *Part* 2. *Append.* 5.

(1.) *He grants, that nothing remains of the Bread after Consecration, but that whereby it was an Object of Sense; because that which is really the Being of one thing, cannot be the Being of another. And he confesses, that the* Modus, *as to the* not being *of the* Substance *after Consecration, is determin'd by the* Councils *of* Constance *and* Trent.

(2.) *He asserts, that real Accidents, supposing them separable from the Substance, are not that whereby the Elements are made the Objects of Sense; because they do not make the Conjunction between the Object and the Faculty.*

(3.) *Since he denies that Accidents have any real Being distinct from the Substance they are in, he grants, that it is as much a Matter of Faith, that there are are no* real Accidents *after Consecration, as that there is no* real Substance; *and he brings the Authorities of the Councils of* Lateran, Florence *and* Trent *to prove it.*

(4.) *As the* Substance *did by Divine Concourse so act upon the Senses before, as to make it be an Object of Sense; so after Consecration, God by his immediate Act makes the same* Appearances, *although the* Substance *be gone. And this, he saith, is the Effect of this miraculous Conversion, which is concealed from our Senses, by God's immediate causing the very same* Appearances, *which came before from the* Substance. *Which Appearances, he saith, are the* Species *mention'd by the* Council *of* Trent, *and other elder Councils and Fathers.*

*Against*

*Againſt this new* Hypotheſis, *a famous* Jeſuit, Theophilus Raynaudus, *oppoſed himſelf with great Vehemency, and urged theſe Arguments againſt it.*

(1.) *That it overthrows the very Nature of a Sacrament, leaving no external viſible Sign, but a perpetual Illuſion of the Senſes, in ſuch a manner, that the Error of one cannot be corrected by another.*

(2.) *That it overthrows the Deſign of the Sacrament, which is to be true and proper Food.* My Fleſh is Meat indeed, *&c.* John 6. *Which, he ſaith, is to be underſtood of the Sacrament, as well as of the Body of Chriſt, and therefore cannot agree with an imaginary Appearance.*

(3.) *It is not conſiſtent with the* Accidents *which befal the Sacramental* Species, *as* to be trod under Foot, to be caſt into indecent Places, to be devoured by Brutes, to be putrified, *&c. If the Body of Chriſt withdraws, there muſt be ſomething beyond mere* Appearances.

(4.) *He makes this Doctrine to be* Heretical, *becauſe the* Council *of* Conſtance *condemned it as an* Heretical Propoſition, *to affirm,* that in the Euchariſt Accidents do not remain without their Subject; *and becauſe the* Council *of* Trent *uſes the Word* Species *in the Senſe then generally received, and ſo it ſignifies the ſame with* Accidents. *Which, ſaith he, farther appears, becauſe the* Council *ſpeaks of the* Species remaining; *but if there be no real Accidents, the Species doth not remain in the Object, but a new Appearance is produced. And it ſeems moſt reaſonable to interpret the Language of the* Council *according to the general Senſe wherein the Words were underſtood at that time.*

VII. *What things were diſputed and oppoſed by ſome in the* Council, *without being cenſured for it, although they were afterwards decreed by a* Major Party, *yet cannot be ſaid to have been there received by a* Catholick Tradition. *Becauſe* Matters *of* Faith, *which have been univerſally received in the* Church, *can never be ſuppoſed to be conteſted in a* Council *without* Cenſure; *but if it appears that there were Heats and warm Debates among the Parties in the* Council *it ſelf, and both think they ſpeak the Senſe of the* Catholick Church; *then we muſt either allow that there was then no known* Catholick Tradition *about thoſe Matters, or that the Divines of the* Church *of* Rome *aſſembled in* Council *did not underſtand what it was. And what happens to be decreed by a* Majority, *can never be concluded from thence to have been the* Tradition *before, becauſe there was a different Senſe of others concerning it. And ſince in a Diviſion a ſingle Perſon may make a* Majority, *it will be very hard to believe,*

*that*

*that he carries* Infallibility *and* Catholick Tradition *along with him.*

*But I think it reasonable, in the Enquiry after* Catholick Tradition, *to take Notice of the different Opinions in the* Council, *and among the* School-men *before it; and not only to observe what was the Sense of the* Roman Church, *but of the* Eastern Churches *too; and where the Matter requires it, to go through the several* Ages *of the Church, up to the* Apostolical Times; *that I may effectually prove, that in the main Points in Controversy between us, which are established by the* Council *of* Trent, *there cannot be produced any* Catholick *and* Apostolical Tradition *for them.*

# THE

# Council of *TRENT*

## EXAMIN'D and DISPROV'D, &c.

THERE are Two Things designed by me in this Treatise:

1. To shew that there is no such thing as universal Tradition for the main Points in Controversy between us and the Church of *Rome*, as they are determined by the Council of *Trent*.

2. To give an Account by what Steps and Degrees, and on what Occasions those Doctrines and Practices came into the Church.

But before I come to particulars, I shall lay down some reasonable *Postulata*.

1. That a *Catholick Tradition* must be universally received among the sound Members of the Catholick Church.

2. That the force of Tradition lies in the Certainty of Conveyance of Matters of Faith from the Apostolical Times; for no new Doctrines being pretended to, there can be no Matter of Faith in any Age of the Church, but what was so in the precedent, and so up to the Apostles times.

3. That it is impossible to suppose the Divines of the Catholick Church to be ignorant what was in their own time received for *Catholick Tradition*. For if it be so hard for others to mistake it, it will be much more so for those whose Business is to enquire into, and to deliver Matters of Faith.

These things premised, I now enter upon the Points themselves; and I begin with,

### I. Tradition's being a Rule of Faith equal with Scriptures.

This is declared by the Council of *Trent* as the Ground-work of their Proceedings.

The Words are, Sess. 4. *That the Council receives Traditions both as to Faith and Manners, either delivered by Christ himself with his own Mouth, or dictated by the Holy Ghost, and preserved in the Catholick Church by a continual Succession, with equal Piety of Affection and Reverence as the Proofs of holy Scripture.*

Necnon Traditiones ipsas, tum ad fidem tum ad mores pertinentes, tanquam vel ore tenus à Christo vel à Spiritu sancto dictatas, & continuâ successione in Ecclesia Catholica conservatas, pari pietatis affectu ac reverentiâ suscipit & veneratur.

Where the Council first supposes *there are such Traditions from Christ and the Holy Ghost distinct from Scripture which relate to Faith*; and then it declares *equal Respect and Veneration due to them.* No one questions but

but the Word of Christ and Dictates of the Holy Ghost deserve equal Respect, howsoever conveyed to us; But the Point is, whether there was a *Catholick Tradition* before this time for an unwritten Word, as a Foundation of Faith, together with the written Word.

1. It is therefore impertinent here to talk of a *Tradition before the written Word*; for our Debate is concerning both being joined together to make a perfect Rule of Faith: and yet this is one of the common Pleas on behalf of Tradition.

2. It is likewise impertinent to talk of that Tradition whereby we do receive the written Word. For the Council first supposes the written Word to be received and embraced as the Word of God, before it mentions the unwritten Word; and therefore, it cannot be understood concerning that Tradition whereby we receive the Scriptures. And the Council affirms, *That the Truth of the Gospel is contained partly in Books that are written, and partly in unwritten Tradition.* By the Truth of the Gospel they cannot mean the Scriptures being the Word of God, but that the Word was contained partly in Scripture and partly in Tradition; and it is therefore impertinent to urge the Tradition for Scripture to prove Tradition to be part of the Rule of Faith, as it is here owned by the Council of *Trent.*

The Council doth not here speak of a Traditionary sense of Scripture, but of a distinct Rule of Faith from the Scripture. For of that it speaks afterwards in the Decree about the use of the Scripture; where it saith, *no man ought to interpret Scripture against the Sense of the Church, to whom it belongs to judge of the true Sense and Meaning of Scripture, nor against the unanimous Consent of the Fathers.* Whereby it is evident, the Council is not to be understood of any Consequences drawn out of Scripture concerning things not expresly contained in it; but it clearly means an unwritten Word distinct from the written, and not contained in it, which, together with that, makes up a Complete Rule of Faith. This being the true sense of the Council, I now shew that there was no *Catholick Tradition* for it.

Which I shall prove by these steps:

1. From the Proceedings of the Council it self.
2. From the Testimony of the Divines of that Church before the Council for several Centuries.
3. From the Canon Law received and allowed in the Church of *Rome.*
4. From the ancient Offices used in that Church.
5. From the Testimony of the Fathers.

1. From the Proceedings of the Council about this matter.

By the *Postulata* it appears, that a *Catholick Tradition* is such as must be known by the sound Members of the Church, and especially of the Divines in it. But it appears by the most allowed Histories of that Council, this Rule of Faith was not so received there. For Cardinal *Pallavicini* tells us that it was warmly debated and canvassed even by the Bishops themselves. The Bishop of *Fano (Bertanus)* urged against it, *that God had not given equal firmness to Tradition as he had done to Scripture, since several Traditions had failed.* But the Bishop of *Bitonto (Mussus)* opposed him, and said, *Though all Truths were not equally to be regarded, yet every Word of God ought, and Traditions as well as Scripture were the Word of God, and the first Principles of Faith; and the greater part of the Council followed him.* It seems then there was a Division in, the

*Hist. Concil. Trident. l. 6. c. 14. n. 3.*

the Council about it; but how could that be, if there were a Catholick Tradition about this Rule of Faith? Could the Biſhops of the Catholick Church, when aſſembled in Council to determine Matters of Faith, be no better agreed about the Rule of Faith; and yet muſt we believe there was at that time a known Catholick Tradition about it, and that it was impoſſible they ſhould err about ſuch a Tradition? Nay farther, the ſame Author tells us, that although this Biſhop had gained the greateſt part of the Council to him, yet his own Heart miſgave him, and in the next Congregation himſelf propoſed, that inſtead of *equal*, it might be put a *like Veneration*; and yet we muſt believe there was a Catholick Tradition for an equal Veneration to Scripture and Tradition. *But the Biſhop of* Chioza, (*Naclantus*) he ſaith, *inveigh'd more bitterly againſt this Equality*, and in the Face of the Council *charged the Doctrine with Impiety*; and he would not allow any Divine Inſpiration to Tradition, but that they were to be conſidered onely as Laws of the Church. It's true, he ſaith, he profeſſed to conſent to the Decree afterwards, but withal he tells us, that he was brought under the Inquiſition not long after, upon Suſpicion of Hereſy, which ſhews they were not well ſatisfied with his Submiſſion. We are extremely beholden to Cardinal *Pallavicini* for his Information in theſe Matters, which are paſt over too jejunely by *F. Paul.* N. 4.

2. I proceed to the Teſtimony of the Divines of the *Roman* Church before the Council of *Trent*. It is obſerved by ſome of them, that when the Fathers appealed to the Tradition of the Church in any controverted Points of Faith, they made their Appeal to thoſe who wrote before the Controverſy was ſtarted; as St. *Auguſtin* did againſt the *Pelagians*, &c. This is a reaſonable Method of proceeding, in caſe Tradition be a Rule of Faith; and therefore muſt be ſo even in this point, whether Tradition be ſuch a Rule or not, For the Divines who wrote before could not be ignorant of the Rule of Faith they received among themſelves. Aug. *l.* 2. c. Julian.

*Gabriel Biel* lived in the latter end of the 15th Century, and he affirms, *That the Scripture alone teaches all things neceſſary to Salvation*; and he inſtances *in the things to be done, and to be avoided, to be loved and to be deſpiſed, to be believed, and to be hoped for.* And again, *That the Will of God is to be underſtood by the Scriptures, and by them alone we know the whole Will of God.* If the whole Will of God were to be known by the Scripture, how could part of it be preſerved in an unwritten Tradition? And if this were then part of the Rule of Faith, how could ſuch a Man, who was Profeſſor of Divinity at *Tubing*, be ignorant of it? I know he ſaith, he took the main of his Book from the Lectures of *Eggelingus*, in the Cathedral Church at *Mentz*; but this adds greater Strength to the Argument, ſince it appears hereby that this Doctrine was not confined to the Schools, but openly delivered in one of the moſt famous Churches of *Germany*.

Et cætera noſtræ ſaluti neceſſaria, quæ omnia ſola docet ſacra Scriptura. Lection. in Canon. Miſſæ 71.

Hæc autem in ſacris Scripturis diſcuntur, per quas ſolas plenam intelligere poſſumus Dei voluntatem. *Id.*

*Cajetan* died not above 12 Years before the Council, who agrees with this Doctrine of *Biel* or *Eggelinus*, (and he was accounted the *Oracle* of his time for Divinty) and he affirms, *That the Scripture gives* Ecce quo tendit utilitas divinæ Scripturæ ad perfectionem hominis Dei (hoc eſt qui totum ſeipſum Deo dat) perfectionem inquam talem ut ſit perfectus ad omne bonum exercendum. *In* 2 *ad Tim.* 3. 16.

*such a Perfection to a Man of God (or one that devoutly serves him) that thereby he is accomplished for every good Work*; how can this be, if there be another Rule of Faith quite distinct from the written Word?

Dico illa omnia Scripta esse ab Apostolis quæ sunt omnibus necessaria, & quæ ipsi palam omnibus vulgò prædicaverunt. *Bellarm. de verbo Dei.* l. 4. c. 11.

*Bellarmine* indeed grants, *That all things which are simply necessary to the Salvation of all, are plainly contained in Scripture*; by which he yields, that the *Scripture* alone is the *Rule* of *Faith* as to necessary Points; and he calls the Scripture *the certain and stable Rule of Faith*, yea, *the most certain and most secure Rule*. If there be then any other, it must be *less certain*, and about Points *not necessary* to Salvation; *i. e.* it must be a Rule, where there is no need of a Rule. For if Mens Salvation be sufficiently provided for by the written Rule, and the Divine Revelation be in order to Mens Salvation, what need any other Revelation to the Church, besides what is written?

Illud imprimis statuendum erit Propheticos & Apostolicos libros juxta mentem Ecclesiæ Catholicæ verum esse verbum Dei & certam ac stabilem Regulam fidei, *Id. l. 1. c. 1.*

At sacris Scripturis quæ Propheticis & Apostolicis literis continentur, nihil est notius, nihil certius. *Id. c. 2.*

Quare cum sacra Scriptura Regula credendi certissima tutissimâque sit. *Ibid.*

L. 4. c. 9.

He asserts farther, *That nothing is* de fide, *but what God hath revealed to the Prophets and Apostles, or is deduced from thence.* This he brings to prove *that whatsoever was received as a Matter of Faith in the Church, which is not found in Scripture, must have come from an Apostolical Tradition.* But if it be *necessary to Salvation*, according to his own Concession, it must be written; and if it be not, how comes it then to be received as a Matter of Faith? Unless it be first proved, that it is necessary to Salvation to receive an unwritten Rule of Faith, as well as a written: For either it must be necessary on its own Account, and then he saith it must be written; and if not, then it can be no otherwise necessary, than because it is to be believed on the Account of a Rule, which makes it necessary; and consequently that Rule must be first proved to be a necessary Article of Faith, which *Bellarmine* hath no where done; but only sets down Rules about knowing true Apostolical Traditions from others in Matters of Faith, wherein he wisely supposes that which he was to prove.

And the true Occasion of setting up this new Rule of Faith is intimated by *Bellarmine* himself, in his first Rule of judging true Apostolical Traditions; which is, *When the Church believes any thing as a Doctrine of Faith, which is not in Scripture*, then saith he, *we must judge it to be an Apostolical Tradition.* Why so? *Otherwise the Church must have erred, in taking that for a Matter of Faith which was not.* And this is the great *Secret* about this *new Rule* of *Faith*; they saw plainly several things were imposed on the Faith of Christians, which could not be proved from *Scripture*, and they must not yield they had once mistaken; and therefore this new, additional, less certain Rule for *unnecessary Points* must be advanced, although they wanted *Tradition* among themselves to prove *Tradition a Rule of Faith*; which I shall now farther make appear from their own *School-Divines* before the Council of *Trent*.

*Etquantum ad ea quæ proponantur omnibus credenda quæ pertinent ad fidem. 2. 2. q. 171. prol.

We are to observe among them what those are they strictly call *Theological Truths*, and by them we shall judge what they made the *Rule of Faith*. For, they do not make a bare *Revelation* to any Person a sufficient Ground for Faith; but they say, * *The Revelation must be publick, and designed for the general Benefit of the Church*; and so

*Aquinas*

*Aquinas* determines, *That our Faith reſts only upon the Revelations made to the Prophets and Apoſtles*; *and Theological Truths* are ſuch as are immediately deduced from *the Principles of Faith*; i. e. *from publick Divine Revelations* owned and received by the Church. The modern Schoolmen, who follow the Council of *Trent*, make *Theological Truths to be deduced from the unwritten, as well as written Word*; or elſe they would not ſpeak conſonantly to their own Doctrine. And therefore if thoſe before them deduce *Theological Truths* only from the written Word, then it will follow that they did not hold the *unwritten Word* to *be a Rule of Faith.*

1 q. 1. a. 5.

Melch. Can. l. 12. c. 3.

*Marſilius ab Inghen* was firſt Profeſſor of Divinity of *Heidelberg*, (at the latter end of the 15*th Century*, ſaith *Bellarmine*, but *Trithemius* ſaith the 14*th*) and he determines, *That a Theological Propoſition is that which is poſitively aſſerted in Scripture, or deduced from thence by good Conſequence*; *and that a Theological Truth, ſtrictly taken, is the Truth of an Article of Faith, or ſomething expreſſed in the Bible, or deduced from thence.* He mentions *Apoſtolical Traditions* afterwards, and joins them with *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtories and Martyrologies*; ſo far was he from ſuppoſing them to be part of the *Rule of Faith.*

Marſil. in 4 lib. Sentent. l. 1. *Proœm.* q. 2. art. 2.

In the beginning of the 15th Century lived *Petrus de Alliaco*, one as famous for his Skill in Divinity, as for his Dignity in the Church, he ſaith, *That Theological Diſcourſe is founded on Scripture, and a Theological Proof muſt be drawn from thence*; *that Theological Principles are the Truths contained in the Canon of Scripture*; *and Concluſions are ſuch as are drawn out of what is contained in Scripture.* So that he not only makes the *Scripture* the *Foundation* of *Faith*, but of all ſorts of *true Reaſoning* about it. He knew nothing of Cardinal *Pallavicini*'s *two firſt Principles of Faith.*

Pet. de Alliaco in Sent. l. 1. q. 1. a. 3.

To the ſame Purpoſe ſpeak *Gregorius Ariminenſis*, about the middle of the 14th Century; he ſaith, *All Theological Diſcourſe is grounded on Scripture, and the Conſequences from it:* Which he not only proves from Teſtimony, but *ex communi omnium conceptione, from the general Conſent of all Chriſtians*; for, ſaith he, *All are agreed that then a thing is proved Theologically, when it is proved from the Words of Scripture.* So that here we have plain *Tradition* againſt *Tradition's being a diſtinct Rule of Faith*; and this delivered by the General of an Order in the Church of *Rome.* He affirms, That the Principles of Theology, are no other than the Truths contained in *the Canon of Scriptare*; and that the *Reſolution* of all *Theological Diſcourſe* is into them; and that there can be no *Theological Concluſion* but what is drawn from *Scripture.*

Greg. Arimin. q. 1. a. 2.

In the former part of that Century lived *Durandus*; he gives a threefold Senſe of *Theology.* 1. *For a Habit whereby we aſſent to thoſe things which are cantained in Scripture, as they are there delivered.* 2. *For a Habit whereby thoſe things are defended and declared which are delivered in Scripture.* 3. *For a Habit of thoſe things which are deduced out of Articles of Faith*; *and ſo it is all one with the holy Scripture.*

Durand. Prol. q. 5. n. 9. a. 13. n. 21.

And in another Place he affirms, *That all Truth is contained in the Holy Scripture at large*; *but for the People's Conveniency the neceſſary Points are ſummed up in the Apoſtles Creed.*

L. 3. Diſt. 25. q. 2.

In his *Preface* before his Book on the *Sentences*, he highly commends *the Scriptures for their Dignity, their Uſefulneſs, their Certainty, their Depth*; and after all concludes, *That in Matters of Faith Men ought to ſpeak agreeably to the Scriptures*; *and whoſoever doth not, breaks the Rule*

*of the Scriptures*, which he calls *the Measure of our Faith*. What *Tradition* did appear then for another Rule of Faith in the 14*th Century*?

But before I proceeded higher I shall shew the Consent of others with these School Divines in the three last *Centuries* before the *Council of Trent*. In the middle of the 15*th* lived *Nicholaus Panormitanus* one of the mighty Reputation for his skill in the *Canon Law*. In the Ch. *Significasti prima*. 1. *De Electione*, debating the Authority of *Pope and Council*, he saith, *If the Pope hath better Reason his Authority is greater than the Councils*; *and if any private person in matters of Faith hath better Reason out of Scripture than the Pope, his saying is to be preferred above the Pope's*. Which words do plainly shew, that the *Scripture* was then looked on as the *onely Rule of Faith*; or else no Man's grounding himself on *Scripture* could make his Doctrine to be preferred before the Pope's; who might alledge *Tradition* against him, and if that were an equal Rule of Faith, the Doctrine of one Rule could not be preferred before the other.

Nam in concernentibus fidem etiam dictum unius privati esset præferendum dicto Papæ, si ille moveretur melioribus novi & veteris Testamenti quam Papæ.

At the same time lived *Tostatus* the famous Bishop of *Avila*, one of infinite Industry and great Judgment, and therefore could not be mistaken in the *Rule of Faith*. In his Preface on *Geneses* he saith, *that there must be a Rule for our understandings to be regulated by, and that Rule must be most certain; and that is contained in Scripture, and therefore we must regulate our understandings thereby. And this he makes to be the measure of Truth and Falshood.* If he knew any other *Rule* of *Faith* besides the *Scriptures*, he would have mentioned it in this place; and not have directed Men onely to them, as the *exact measure of Truth and Falshood.*

Cùm ergo in omni veritate veritas divina sit certior & immutabilior, ergo omnes aliæ debent regulari per illam, & in quantum coformantur illi sunt veræ; in quantum autem deviant ab illa, deviant à natura veritatis. Sacra autem Scriptura veritas divina est, ideo judicium nostrum debemus regulare per illam applicando ad eam, &c. *Tostat.* in Ep. *Hieron.* c. 6. p. 28. D.

In the beginning of this *Century Thomas Walden* (Confessor to our *Henry* V. saith *Thrithemius*,) disputed sharply against *Wickliff*; but he durst not set up the Church's *Authority* or *Tradition equal with the Scriptures*. For when he mention *Tradition* after *Scripture*, he utterly *disclaims any such thought as that of Equality between them*; but he desires a due distance may be kept between *Canonical Scripture* and *Ecclesiastical Authority* or *Tradition*. In the first place he saith *we ought to believe the holy Scriptures*; then *the Definitions and Customs of the Catholick Church*; but he more fully explains himself in another place, where he plainly asserts, *that nothing else is to be received by such Faith as the Scripture and Christ's symbolical Church*; *but for all other Authorities, the lowest degree is that of Catholick Tradition, the next of the Bishops, especially of the Apostolical Churches, and the Roman in the first place*; *and above all these he places that of a General Council*; but when he hath so done, he saith, *all these Authorities are to be regarded but as the Instructions of Elders, and Admonitions of Fathers.* So that the chief Opposers of *Wickliff* had not yet found out this *new Rule of Faith.*

Non quod in Auctoritate æquantur, absit; sed sequantur. Non quidem in subsidium Auctoritatis Canonicæ, sed in admonitionem posteriorum. l. 2. Art. 2. c. 22. c. 28. n. 27.

Much about the same time lived *Joh. Gerson*, whom Cardinal *Zabarella declared, in the Council of* Constance, *to be the greatest Divine in his time*, and therefore could not be ignorant of the *true Rule of Faith.* He agrees with *Panormitan* in this, *that if a Man be well skilled in Scriptures, his Doctrine deserves more to be regarded than the Pope's Declaration*; *for*,

Joh. Gerson, *Exam. Doctr. p.* 540. *Part.* 1. *Cons.* 3.

saith

faith he, *the Gospel is more to be believed than the Pope, and if such a one teaches a Doctrine to be contained in Scripture, which the Pope either knows not or mistakes, it is plain whose Judgment is to be preferred.* Nay, he goes farther, *that if in a General Council he finds the Majority incline to that part which is contrary to Scripture, he is bound to oppose it,* and he instances in *Hilary.* And he shews, *that since the Canon of Scripture received by the Church, no Authority of the Church is to be equalled to it.* He allows *a Judgment* of *Discretion* in private persons, and a *Certainty of the literal Sense* of *Scripture* attainable thereby. He makes *the Scripture the onely standing Infallible Rule of Faith for the whole Church to the end of the world. And whatever Doctrine is not agreeable thereto, is to be rejected either as Heretical, suspicious, or impertinent to Religion.* If the Council of *Trent* had gone by this *Rule*, we had never heard of the Creed of *Pius* IV.

*Conf.* 6. Nihil audendum dicere de divinis nisi quæ nobis à sacra scriptura tradita sunt.

Cujus ratio est, quoniam scriptura nobis tradita est tanquam Regula sufficiens & infallibilis, pro Regimine totius Ecclesiastici corporis & membrorum usque in finem seculi. Est igitur talis ars, talis regula, vel exemplar, cui se non conformans alia Doctrina, vel abjicienda est ut hæreticalis, aut suspecta, aut impertinens ad Religionem prorsus est habenda. Exam. Doctr. Part. 2. Consid. 1.

In the beginning of the 14th Century lived *Nicolaus de Lyra*, who parallels *the Scriptures in matters of Faith* with *First principles in Sciences*; for *as other Truths are tried in them by their reduction to First-principles, so in matters of Faith by their reduction to Canonical Scriptures, which are of divine Revelation, which is impossible to be false.* If he had known any other Principles which would have made Faith impossible to be false, he would never have spoken thus of Scripture alone. But to return to the School Divines.

Lyra, *Præfat. ad lib.* Tobiæ.

About the same time lived *Joh. Duns Scotus*, the head of a School, famous for Subtilty; He affirms, *that the Holy Scripture doth sufficiently contain all matters necessary to Salvation; because by it we know what we are to believe, hope for, and practice.* And after he hath enlarged upon them, he concludes in these words, *patet quod Scriptura sacra sufficienter continet Doctrinam necessariam viatori.* If this be understood onely of *Points simply necessary*, then however it proves, that all such things necessary to Salvation are therein contained; and no Man is bound to enquire after unnecessary Points. How then can it be necessary to embrace another Rule of Faith, when all things necessary to Salvation are sufficiently contained in Scripture?

Scot. *in Sent. Prolog.* & 2. *n.* 14.

But *Thomas Aquinas* is more expres in this matter; For he saith, *that those things which depend on the Will of God, and are above any desert of ours, can be known no otherways by us, than as they are delivered in Scriptures by the Will of God, which is made known to us.*

Ea enim quæ ex sola Dei voluntate supra omne debitum Creaturæ,

nobis innotescere non possunt, nisi quatenus in sacra Scriptura traduntur, per quam Divina voluntas nobis innotescit. 3. q. 1. a. 3. in C.

This is so remarkable a Passage, that *Suarez* could not let it escape without corrupting it; for instead of *Scripture* he makes him to speak of Divine Revelation in general, *viz.* under *Scripture he comprehends all*; that is, under the *written Word* he means the *unwritten.* If he had meant so, he was able to have expressed his own mind more plainly; and *Cajetan* apprehended no such meaning in his words. But this is a matter of so great consequence, that I shall prove from other passages in him, that he asserted the same Doctrine, *viz. That the Scripture was the onely Rule of Faith.*

Suarez, *in* 3. *p.* 117.

1. He

Authoritatibus autem Canonicæ Scripturæ utitur propriè ex neceſſitate argumentando; autoritatibus autem aliorum Doctorum Eccleſiæ quaſi arguendo ex propriis ſed probabiliter. Innititur enim fides noſtra Revelationi Apoſtolis & Prophetis ſanctæ, qui Canonicos libros ſcripſerunt, non autem Revelationi ſi qua fuit aliis Doctoribus facta. 1. q. 1. a. 8. ad 2.

1. He makes *no Proofs of matters of Faith to be ſufficient but ſuch as are deduced from Scripture*; *and all other Arguments from Authority to be only probable*; *nay although ſuch Perſons had particular Revelations.* How can this be conſiſtent with another Rule of Faith diſtinct from *Scripture?* For if he had owned any ſuch, he muſt have deduced neceſſary Arguments from thence, as well as from Canonical Scriptures. But if all other Authorities be only *probable*, then they cannot make any thing neceſſary to be believed.

Quæ igitur fidei ſunt tenenda probari niſi per Autoritates his qui Autoritates ſuſcipiunt. 1. q. 32. a. 1. c.

Si autem ad veritatem eloquiorum ſc. ſacrorum reſpicit, hoc & nos Canone utimur. Ib.

2. He affirms, *that to thoſe who receive the Scriptures we are to prove nothing but by the Scriptures, as matter of Faith.* For by *Authorities* he means nothing but the *Scriptures*; as appears by the former place, and by what follows, where he mentions the *Canon of Scripture* expreſly.

Dicendum quod veritas fidei in Sacra Scriptura diffuſè continetur--ideò fuit neceſſarium ut ex ſententiis Sacræ Scripturæ aliquid manifeſtum ſummariè colligeretur, quod proponeretur omnibus ad credendum; quod quidem non eſt additum Sacræ Scripturæ, ſed potius ex Sacra Scriptura ſumptum. 2. 2. q. 1. a. 9. ad primum.

3. He aſſerts that *the Articles of the Creed are all contained in Scripture, and are drawn out of Scripture, and put together by the Church only for the Eaſe of the People.* From hence it neceſſarily follows that the Reaſon of believing the *Articles* of the *Creed*, is to be taken from the *written Word* and not from any *unwritten Tradition.* For elſe he needed not to have been ſo careful to ſhew, that they were all taken out of Scripture.

Quantum ad prima Credibilia, quæ ſunt Articuli fidei, tenetur homo explicitè credere, ſicut & tenetur habere fidem.

Quantum autem ad alia credibilia non tenetur homo explicitè credere, ſed ſolùm implicitè, vel in præparatione animi in quantum paratus eſt credere quicquid Scriptura continet; ſed tunc ſolùm hujuſmodi tenetur explicitè credere, quando hoc ei conſtiterit in Doctrina fidei contineri. 2. 2. q. 2. a. 5. c.

4. He diſtinguiſheth the Matters of Faith in *Scripture, ſome to be believed for themſelves*, which he calls *prima Credibilia*; theſe he ſaith *every one is bound explicitly to believe*; *but for other things he is bound onely implicitly, or in a preparation of mind, to believe whatever is contained in Scripture*; *and then onely is he bound to believe explicitly when it is made clear to him to be contained in the Doctrine of Faith.* Which words muſt imply the *Scripture* to be the onely Rule of Faith; For otherwiſe *implicit Faith*, muſt relate to whatever is proved to be an *unwritten Word.*

From all this it appears that *Aquinas* knew nothing of a *Traditional Rule of Faith*; although he lived after the *Lateran Council*, A. D. 1215. being born about nine years after it.

Et nihil ꝺ nobis dicendum eſt, præter ea quæ nobis ex Sacris Eloquiis clarent. *Bonav.* in 3 Sent. Diſt. 1. Art. 2. q. 2.

And *Bonaventure*, who died the ſame year with him, affirms, *that nothing was to be ſaid*, (about Matters of Faith) *but what is made clear out of the Holy Scriptures.*

Not long after them lived *Henricus Gandavenſis*; and he delivers theſe things which are very material to our purpoſe.

1. *That*

1. *That the Reaſon why we believe the Guides of the Church ſince the Apoſtles, who work no Miracles, is, becauſe they preach nothing but what they have left in their moſt certain Writings, which are delivered down to us pure and uncorrupt by an univerſal conſent of all that ſucceeded to our times.* Where we ſee he makes the Scriptures to be the onely Certain Rule, and that we are to judge of all other Doctrines by them.

Quod autem credimus poſterioribus circa quos non apparent virtutes divinæ, hoc eſt, quia non prædicant alia quàm quæ illi in ſcriptis certiſſimis reliquérunt, quæ conſtat per medios in nullo fuiſſe vitiata ex conſenſione concordi in eis omnium ſuccedentium uſque ad tempora noſtra. *Hen. Gandav.* Sum. Art. 9. q. 3. n. 13. 2.

2. *That Truth is more certainly preſerved in Scripture than in the Church; becauſe that is fixed and immutable, and Men are variable, ſo that multitudes of them may depart from the Faith, either through Error or Malice; but the true Church will always remain in ſome righteous perſons.* How then can *Tradition* be a *Rule of Faith* equal with Scriptures, which depends upon the Teſtimony of Perſons who are ſo very fallible?

Quia veritas ipſa in Scriptura immobiliter & impermutabiliter ſemper cuſtoditur--In perſonis autem Eccleſiæ mutabilis eſt & variabilis ut diſſentire fidei poſſit multitudo illorum, & vel per errorem, vel per malitiam à fide diſcedere licet; ſemper Eccleſia in aliquibus juſtis ſtabit, Art. 8. q. 1. n. 5.

I might carry this way of Teſtimony on higher ſtill, as when *Richardus de S. Victore* ſaith, in the thirteenth Century, *that every Truth is ſuſpected by him, which is not confirmed by Holy Scripture*; but inſtead of that I ſhall now proceed to the *Canon Law*, as having more Authority than particular Teſtimonies.

Suſpecta eſt mihi omnis veritas, quam non confirmat Scripturarum Auctoritas. *Rich.* de *S. Victore*, De Præpar. Animi ad Contempl. Patt. 1. c. 81.

3. As to the *Canon Law* collected by *Gratian*, I do not inſiſt upon its *Conformation* by *Eugenius*, but upon its *univerſal Reception* in the *Church* of *Rome*. And from thence I ſhall evidently prove that *Tradition* was not allowed to be a *Rule of Faith equal with the Scriptures.*

*Diſt.* 9. *c.* 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10. *The Authority and Infallibility of the Holy Scripture is aſſerted above all other Writings whatſoever; for all other Writings are to be examined, and Men are to judge of them as they ſee cauſe.*

Now *Bellarmine* tells us, *that the unwritten Word is ſo called, not that it always continues unwritten, but that it was ſo by the firſt Author of it.* So that the *unwritten Word* doth not depend on mere *Oral Tradition*, according to him, but it may be found in *the Writers of the Church*; but the Canon Law expreſly excludes *all other Writings*, let them contain what they will, from being admitted to any Competition with *Canonical Scriptures*; and therefore according to that, no part of the Rule of Faith was contained in any other than Canonical Scriptures.

De verbo Dei. l. 4. c. 2. c. 12.

*Diſt.* 37. *c. Relatum*, A man is ſuppoſed to *have an entire and firm Rule of Faith in the Scriptures.*

Cùm enim ex divinis Scripturis integram quis & firmam Regulam veritatis ſuſceperit.

*Cauſ.* 8. *q.* 1. *c. Nec ſufficere, The Scriptures are ſaid to be the onely Rule both of Faith and Life.*

Quibus ſacris literis unica eſt credendi pariter & vivendi Regula præſcripta.

And the Gloſs on the Canon Law there owns the Scripture to be the Rule for matters of Faith; but very pleaſantly applies it to the Clergy, and thinks Images enough for the Laity.

*Cauſ.*

*Cauſ.* 24. *q.* 1. *c. Non afferentes.* The Scriptures are acknowledged to be *the true Balance*; *and that we are not ſo much to weigh what we find there, as to own what we find there already weighed.* Which muſt imply the Scripture alone to be that *Meaſure we are to truſt to.*

*Diſt.* 8. *c.* 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9. It is there ſaid, *that Cuſtom muſt yield to Truth and Reaſon, when that is diſcovered, and that for this Reaſon, becauſe hriſt ſaid, I am Truth and not Cuſtom.* Now, if Tradition be an Infallible Rule of Faith, Cuſtom ought always to be preſumed to have Truth and Reaſon of its ſide. For, if we can once ſuppoſe a Cuſtom to prevail in the Church againſt Truth and Reaſon, it is impoſſible that Tradition ſhould be Infallible; for what is that but Ancient Cuſtom?

*Cauſ.* 11. *Q.* 3. *c.* 101. *Si is qui præeſt. If any one commands what God hath forbidden, or forbids what God hath commanded, he is to be accurſed of all that love God. And if he requires any thing beſides the Will of God, or what God hath evidently required in Scripture, he is to be looked on as a falſe Witneſs of God, and a Sacrilegious Perſon.* How can this be, if there be another infallible way of conveying the Will of God beſides the Scriptures?

Sed in hanc inſipientiam cadunt, qui cùm ad cognoſcendam veritatem aliquo impediuntur obſcuro, non ad Propheticas voces, non ad Apoſtolicas literas, nec ad Evangelicas auctoritates, ſed ad ſeipſos recurrunt.

*Cauſ.* 24. *q.* 3. *c.* 30. *c. Quid autem. In matters of doubt it is ſaid that Men are to fly to the Written Word for ſatisfaction, and that it is folly not to do it.* It is true, Mens own Fancies are oppoſed to Scripture, but againſt Mens Fancies no other Rule is mentioned but that of the Written Word.

Nec quaſi hoc ſacra Scriptura contineat, quo negato tota Scriptura ſacra redditur dubia; & per conſequens articuli Fidei, qui habeat per Scripturam ſacram probari reddunt tur dubii & incerti.

*Joh.* 22. *Extravag. c. Quia quorundam. Tit.* 14. makes his Appeal to Scripture in the Controverſie then on foot about Uſe and Property; *Dicunt nobis ubi legunt, &c.* and he ſhews *that if it were a matter of Faith, it muſt be contained in Scripture, either expreſly or by reduction; otherwiſe the Scripture would be no certain Rule; and by conſequence, the Articles of Faith which are proved by Scripture, would be rendred doubtful and uncertain.*

Extrav. Joh. 22. *Cum inter Gloſſ. per conſequens.* Turrecrem. *de Eccleſia, l.* 4. *part.* 2. *c.* 9.

The Gloſſer there ſaith, *Whence comes this conſequence*; and refers to another place; where he makes it out thus; *that Faith can onely be proved by the Scripture, and therefore if the Authority of that be deſtroy'd, Faith would be taken away.* The Roman Editors for an Antidote refer to Cardinal *Turrecremata*, who doth indeed ſpeak of *Catholick Truths*, and he which are not to be found in the *Canon* of *Scripture*; quotes a paſſage in the *Canon Law* for it under the name of *Alex.* 3. *c. cum Marthæ Extrav. de Celebr. Miſſæ.* but in truth it is *Innoc.* 3. *Decretal. l.* 3. *Tit.* 14. and yet this will not prove what he aims at; for the Queſtion was about the Author of the Words added in the Euchariſt to thoſe of Chriſt's Inſtitution; and he pleads that many of Chriſt's words and actions are omitted by the Evangeliſts, which the Apoſtles afterwards ſet down; and he inſtances in Saint *Paul*, as to thoſe words of Chriſt, *It is more bleſſed to give than to receive*; and elſe. But what is all this to Catholick Truths not being contained in Scripture either in words or by conſequence; The Cardinal was here very much to ſeek, when he had nothing but ſuch a Teſtimony as this to produce in ſo weighty and ſo new a Doctrine. The beſt Argument he produces is, a horrible

Turrecrem. *l.* 2. *c.* 18.

blunder

blunder of *Gratian*'s, where S. *Auguſtin* ſeems to reckon the Decretal Epiſtles equal with the Scriptures, *Diſt.* 19. *c. in Canonicis*; which the Roman Correctors were aſhamed of, and confeſs that S. *Auguſtin* ſpeaks only of Canonical Epiſtles in Scripture. So hard muſt they ſtrain, who among Chriſtians would ſet up any other Rule equal with the Written Word.

4. I proceeded to prove this from the ancient Offices of the Roman Church.

In the Office produced by *Morinus* out of the Vatican *MS.* which he ſaith *was very ancient*; the Biſhop before his Conſecration was aked, *If he would accommodate all his prudence, to the beſt of his skill, to the Senſe of Holy Scripture*; Morin. *de Ordinat. Sacris, p.* 275.

Reſp. *Yes, I will with all my heart conſent, and obey it in all things.*

Inter. *Wilt thou teach the People, by Word and Example, the things which thou learneſt out of Holy Scriptures?*

Reſp. *I will.*

And then immediately follows the *Examen* about Manners.

In another old Office of S. *Victor*'s, there are the ſame Queſtions in the ſame manner. Morin. *p.* 333.

And ſo in another of the Church of *Rouen* lately produced by *Mabillon*, which he ſaith was about *William* the Conquerour's time, there is not a word about *Traditions*; which crept into *Ordo Romanus*, and from thence hath been continued in the Roman Pontificals. But it is obſervable, that the *Ordo Romanus* owns that the *Examen* was originally taken out of the Gallican Offices, (although it does not appear in thoſe imperfect ones lately publiſhed at *Rome* by *Thomaſius*) and therefore we may juſtly ſuſpect that the additional Queſtions about Traditions were the Roman Interpolations, after it came to be uſed in that Pontifical. Mabillon *Analect. To.* 2. *p.* 468.

And the firſt Office in *Morinus* was the true ancient Gallican Office. But if Tradition had been then owned as a Rule of Faith, it ought no more to have been omitted in the ancient Offices than in the modern.

And the ancient Writers about Eccleſiaſtical Offices ſpeak very agreeably to the moſt ancient Offices about this matter. *Amalarius* ſaith *the Goſpel is the Fountain of Wiſdom*; *and that the Preachers ought to prove the Evangelical Truth out of the ſacred Books. Iſidore, that we ought to think nothing* (as to matters of Faith) *but what is contained in the two Teſtaments. Rabanus Maurus, that the knowledge of the Scriptures is the foundation and perfection of Prudence. That Truth and Wiſdom are to be tried by them*; *and the perfect inſtruction of Life is contained in them.* Our Venerable *Bede* agrees with them, when he ſaith, *that the true Teachers take out of the Scriptures of the old and new Teſtament that which they preach*; *and therefore have their minds imploy'd in finding out the true meaning of them.* Amalarius *de Officiis, l.* 3. *c.* 5. Iſidor. *de Offic. l.* 2. *c.* 23. Rab. Maur. *de Inſt. Cler. l.* 3. *c.* 2. *l.* 2. *c.* 53. Bed. *in Cant. l.* 5. *De Tabernaculo l.* 1. *c.* 6.

5. I now come to the *Fathers*; wherein I am in great meaſure prevented by a late Dicourſe, wherein it is at large ſhewed that the *Fathers* made uſe of no other Rule but the *Scriptures* for deciding Controverſies; therefore I ſhall take another method, which is to ſhew that thoſe who do ſpeak moſt advantagiouſly of *Tradition*, did not intend to ſet up another *Rule of Faith* diſtinct from Scripture. *Vindic. of the Anſw. to ſome late Papers.*

And here I ſhall paſs over all thoſe Teſtimonies of Fathers which ſpeak either of *Tradition* before the *Canon* of *Scripture*, or to thoſe who did not receive it, or of the *Tradition* of *Scripture* it ſelf, or of ſome

*Rites* and *Customs* of the *Church*, as wholly impertinent. And when these are cut off, there remain scarce any to be considered, besides that of *Vincentius Lerinensis*, and one Testimony of S. *Basil*.

I begin with *Vincentius Lerinensis*, who by some is thought so great a Favourer of Tradition; but he saith not a word of it as a Rule of Faith distinct from Scripture; for he asserts the *Canon of Scripture to be sufficient of it self for all things*. How can that be, if Tradition be a Rule of Faith distinct from it? He makes indeed Catholick Tradition the best Interpreter of Scripture; and we have no reason to decline it in the Points in dispute between us, if *Vincentius* his Rules be follow'd.

*Commonit.* 1. c. 2. Cùm sit perfectus Scripturarum Canon sibiq; ad omnia satis superq; sufficiat.

1. *If Antiquity, Universality and Consent be joyned.*

2. *If the difference be observed between old Errors and new ones. For,* saith he, *when they had length of time, Truth is more easily concealed, by those who are concerned to suppress it. And in those Cases we have no other way to deal with them, but by Scripture and ancient Councils.* And this is the Rule we profess to hold to.

c. 39.

But to suppose any one part of the Church to assume to it self the Title of Catholick, and then to determine what is to be held for Catholick Tradition by all Members of the Catholick Church, is a thing in it self unreasonable, and leaves that part under an impossibility of being reclaimed. For in case the Corrupt Part be judge, we may be sure no Corruptions will be ever owned. *Vincentius* grants that *Arianism* had once extremely the advantage in Point of Universality, and had made many Councils of its side; if now the prevailing Party be to judge of *Catholick Tradition*, and all are bound to submit to its Decrees without farther Examination, as the Author of *the Guide in Controversies* saith upon these Rules of *Vincentius*; then I say all Men were then bound to declare themselves *Arians*. For if *the Guides of the present Church are to be trusted and relied upon for the Doctrine of the Apostolical Church downwards*; how was it possible for any Members of the Church then to oppose *Arianism*, and to reform the Church after its prevalency? To say *it was condemned by a former Council*, doth by no means clear the difficulty; For *the present Guides must be trusted*, whether they were rightly condemned or not; and nothing can be more certain, than that they would be sure to condemn those who condemned them. But *Vincentius* saith, *Every true Lover of Christ preferred the ancient Faith before the novel betraying of it*; but then he must chuse this ancient Faith against the judgment of the present Guides of the Church. And therefore that, according to *Vincentius*, can be no Infallible Rule of Faith

c. 6.

Of the Necessity of Church Guides p. 201.

p. 199.

But *whether the present Universality dissents from Antiquity, whose Judgment shall be sooner taken than its own?* Saith the same Author, This had been an excellent Argument in the mouth of *Ursacius* or *Valens* at the Council of *Ariminum*; and I do not see what Answer the Guide in Controversies could have made. *But both are Parties, and is not the Councils Judgment to be taken rather than a few Opposers?* So that, for all that I can find by these Principles, *Arianism* having the greater number, had hard luck not to be established as the Catholick Faith. But if in that case, particular Persons were to judge between the New and the Old Faith, then the same Reason will still hold, unless the Guides of the Church have obtained a new Patent of Infallibility since that time.

The great Question among us, is, Where the true ancient Faith is; and how we may come to find it out? We are willing to follow the ancient Rules in this matter. The Scripture is allowed to be an Infal-

lible

lible Rule on all hands; and I am proving that Tradition was not allowed in the ancient Church as distinct from it. But the present Question is, how far Tradition is to be allowed in giving the Sense of Scripture between us. *Vincentius* saith, *we ought to follow it when there is Antiquity, Universality and Consent*: This we are willing to be tried by. But here comes another Question, Who is to be Judge of these? *The present Guides of the Catholick Church?* To what purpose then are all those Rules? Will they condemn themselves? Or, as the *Guide* admirably saith, *If the present Universality be its own Judge, when can we think it will witness its departure from the true Faith?* And if it will not, what a Case is the Church in, under such a pretended *Universality?* *p.* 199.

The utmost use I can suppose then, *Vincentius* his Rules can be of to us now, is in all that Case which he puts when Corruptions and Errors have had time to take root and fasten themselves; and that is, *By an Appeal to Scripture and Ancient Councils.* But because of the Charge of Innovation upon us, we are content to be tried by his second Rule. *By Consent of the Fathers of great Reputation, who are agreed on all hands to have lived and died in the Communion of the Catholick Church: and what they delivered freely, constantly and unanimously, let that be taken for the undoubted and certain Rule in judging between us.* But *if the present Guides must come in to be Judges here again,* then all our labour is lost, and *Vincentius* his signifie just nothing.

The Testimony of S. *Basil* is by Mr. *White* magnified above the rest, and that out of his Book *de Spiritu Sancto* above all others, to prove that the Certainty of Faith depends on Tradition; and not merely on Scripture. The force of it is said to lye in this, *that the Practice of the Church, in saying, with the Holy Spirit, though not found in Scripture, is to determine the Sense of the Article of Faith about the Divinity of the Holy Ghost.* But to clear this place, we are to observe, *Tabulæ Suffragial. p.* 54.

1. That S. *Basil* doth not insist on Tradition for the Proof of the Article of Faith, for he expressly disowns it in that Book; *It is not enough,* saith he, *that we have it by Tradition from our Fathers; for our Fathers had it from the Will of God in Scripture, as appears by those Testimonies I have set down already, which they took for their Foundations.* Nothing can be plainer than that S. *Basil* made Scripture alone the Foundation of Faith as to this Point. And no one upon all Occasions speaks more expressly than he doth as to the Sufficiency of Scripture for a Rule of Faith; and he was too great and too wise a Man to contradict himself.

Ἀλλ' ἐ τοῦτο ἡμῖν ἐξαρχῆς, κἀκεῖνοι γὰρ τῇ βελήμασι τῇ γεγραφῆς ἠκολούθησαν, ἐκ τῆς μαρτυριῶν, ἃς μικρῷ πρόσθεν ὑμῖν ἐκ τ γεγραφῆς παρεθέμεθα, τὰς ἀρχὰς λαβόντες. *De Spir Sancto c.* 7.

2. That there were different forms of speech used in the Church concerning the Holy Ghost, some take out of Scripture, and others received by Tradition from the Fathers. When he proves the Divinity of the Holy Ghost he appeals to Scripture, and declares, that he would neither think nor speak otherwise than he found there. But it was objected that the Form S. *Basil* used was not found in Scripture; he answers, that the equivalent is there found; and that there were some things received by Tradition, which had the same force towards Piety. And if we take away all unwritten Customs, we shall do wrong to to the Gospel, and leave a bare name to the Publick Preaching. And from thence he insists on some Traditionary Rites, as the Sign of the Cross, Praying towards the East, *&c.* His business is to shew that to the greater solemnity of Christian Worship several Customs *Ascet. Reg.* 26. *Reg.* 80. *c.* 22. *De Sp. Sancti c.* 9. *c.* 10. *c.* 21.

were obſerved in the Church, which are not to be found in Scripture. And if other ancient Cuſtoms were received which are not commanded in Scripture, he ſees no Reaſon that they ſhould find ſuch fault with this. And this is the whole force of S. *Baſil*'s Reaſoning, which can never be ſtretched to the ſetting up Tradition as a Rule of Faith diſtinct from Scripture.

c. 29.

Having thus ſhewed that there was no Catholick Tradition for this New Rule of Faith, I am now to give an Account how it came into the Church.

The firſt Step that was made towards it, was by the ſecond Council of *Nice*. For, although the Emperor in the Synodical Epiſtle propoſed to them the true ancient Method of judging in Councils, *by the Books of Scripture placed on a Throne in the middle of the Council*; yet they found, they could by no means do their buſineſs that Way, and therefore, as *Ballarmin* obſerves, they ſet up *Tradition* in the 6th and 7th Seſſions, and pronounced Anathema's againſt thoſe who rejected unwritten Traditions. But although there were then almoſt as little pretence for Tradition as Scripture in matter of Images; yet there having been a practice among them, to ſet up and to worſhip Images, (which *Richerius* thinks came firſt into the Church from the Reverence ſhewed to the Emperors Statues) they thought this the ſecureſt way to advance that, which they could never defend by Scripture.

Richer. *Hiſt. Conc. General. l.* 1. *c.* 11. *n.* 13.

But this prevailed very little in the Weſtern Church, as is well known by the rejection of that Synod; however Pope *Hadrian* joined with them, and produced a wretched Tradition about *Sylveſter* and *Conſtantine* to juſtifie their Proceedings; as appears by the Acts of that Council. And from the time that Images were received at *Rome*, the force of Tradition was magnified; and by degrees it came to be made uſe of to juſtifie other Practices, for which they had nothing elſe to plead.

Hitherto Tradition was made uſe of for matters of Practice, and Scripture was generally received as the Rule of Faith; but ſome of the Schoolmen found it impoſſible to defend ſome Doctrines held in the Church of *Rome* by mere Scripture, and therefore they were forced to call in the Help of Tradition. The moſt remarkable of theſe was *Scotus*, who although in his Prologue he aſſerted, as is ſaid already, *that the Scripture did ſufficiently contain all things neceſſary to Salvation*; yet when he came to particular Points, he found Scripture alone would never do their buſineſs. And eſpecially as to the Sacraments of the Church, about which he ſaw the Church of *Rome* then held many things which could never be proved from thence. And this was the occaſion of Traditions being taken in for a partial Rule.

Scot. *in l.* 1. *Sent. Diſt.* 11.

For after the Council of *Lateran* had declared ſeveral things to be of Faith, which were in no former Creeds, as *Scotus* confeſſes, and they were bound to defend them as Points of Faith, the Men of Wit and Subtilty, ſuch as *Scotus* was, were very hard put to it, to find out ways to prove thoſe to have been old Points of Faith, which they knew to be very new. Then they betook themſelves to two things, which would ſerve for a colour to blind the common People; and thoſe were,

*l.* 4. *Diſt.* 11. *n.* 15.

1. That it was true, theſe things were not in Scripture; but *Chriſt ſaid to his Diſciples, I have many things to ſay unto you*, &c. and among thoſe many things they were to believe theſe new Doctrines to be ſome.

2. When

2. When this would not ſerve, then they told them, though theſe Doctrines were not explicitly in Scripture, yet they were implicitly there; and the Church had authority to fetch them out of thoſe dark places, and to ſet them in a better light. And thus *Scotus* helped himſelf out in that dark Point of *Tranſubſtantiation.* Firſt he attempts to make it out by Tradition; but finding that would not do the buſineſs effectually, he runs to the Authority of the Church, eſpecially in the buſineſs of Sacraments, and *we are to ſuppoſe*, ſaith he, *that the Church doth expound the Scripture with the ſame Spirit which indited them.* This was a brave *Suppoſition* indeed, but he offers no proof of it. *n.* 14.

If we allow *Scotus* to have been the Introducer of *Tradition*, as to ſome Points of Faith, yet I have made it appear, that his Doctrine was not received in the Schools. But after the Council of *Conſtance* had declared ſeveral Propoſitions to be *Heretical*, which could not be condemned by Scripture, there was found a Neceſſity of holding, that there were *Catholick Truths* not contained in Scripture. The firſt Propoſition there condemned was, *That the Subſtance of Bread and Wine remain in the Sacrament of the Altar:* the ſecond, *That the Accidents do not remain without their Subject:* Now how could ſuch as theſe be condemned by Scripture? But although only ſome were ſaid to be *Heretical*, yet all were ſaid to be *againſt Catholick Truth.* But where is this *Catholick Truth* to be found? Cardinal *Cuſanus* thought of a *current ſenſe of Scripture, according to the Churches Occaſions*; ſo that though the Churches Practice ſhould be directly contrary, yet the Scripture was to be underſtood as the Church practiſed. This was a very plain and effectual way, if it had not been too groſs; and therefore it was thought much better by Cardinal *Turrecremata*, to found Catholick Verities on *unwritten Tradition*, as well as on Scripture.

Scripturas eſſe ad tempus adaptatas & variè intellectas, ità ut uno tempore ſecundùm currentem

univerſalem ritum exponerentur, mutato ritu iterum ſententia mutaretur. *Cuſan.* ad *Bohem.* Epiſt. 2.

After this, *Leo* X. in his famous Bull againſt *Luther*, *Exurge Domine*, made a farther ſtep; for the 22 Propoſition condemned therein, is *That it is certain that it is not in the power of the Church or Pope to appoint new Articles of Faith.* It ſeems then the Pope or Church have a Power to conſtitute new Articles of Faith; and then neither Scripture nor Tradition can be the certain Rule of Faith, but the Preſent Church or Pope.

This had put an end to the buſineſs, if it would have taken; but the World being wiſer, and the Errors and Corruptions complained of not being to be defended by Scripture, Tradition was pitched upon as a ſecure Way; and accordingly ſeveral attempts were made towards the ſetting of it up, by ſome Provincial Councils before that of *Trent.* So in the Council of *Sens*, 1527. Can. 53. It is declared to be a pernicious Error to receive nothing but what is deduced from Scripture, becauſe Chriſt delivered many things to his Apoſtles which were never written. But not one thing is alledged as a matter of Faith ſo conveyed; but only ſome Rites about Sacraments and Prayer; and yet he is declared a Heretick as well as Schiſmatick, who rejects them. Indeed *the Apoſtles Creed* is mentioned, but not as to the Articles contained in it, but as to the *Authors* of it. But what is there in all this that makes a Man guilty of Hereſie?

*Jod. Clicthoveus*, a Doctor of *Paris*, the next year wrote an Explication and Defence of this Council, but he miſtakes the Point; for he runs upon it as if it were, *whether all things to be believed and obſerved in the Church*,

*Church, were to be expreſly ſet down in Scripture?* Whereas a juſt conſequence out of it is ſufficient. And the greateſt ſtrength of what he ſaith to the purpoſe, is, *that the other Opinion was condemned in the Council of* Conſtance.

And from no better a Tradition than this did the Council of *Trent* declare *the unwritten Word to be a Rule of Faith equal with the Scriptures.*

## II. About the Canon of Scripture, defined by the Council of Trent.

This is declared by the Council of *Trent*, *Seſſ.* 4. and therein the Books of *Tobias*, *Judith*, *Wiſdom of* Solomon, *Eccleſiaſtiucs*, *Maccabees* and *Baruch* are received for *Canonical*, *with the twenty two Books* in the *Hebrew Canon*, and an *Anathema* is denounced againſt thoſe who do not. And preſently it adds, *that hereby the World might ſee what Authorities the Council proceeded on for confirming matters of Faith as well as reforming manners.*

Now to ſhew that there was no *Catholick Tradition* for the ground of this *Decree*, we are to obſerve,

1. That theſe *Canonical Books* are not ſo called in a large ſenſe for ſuch as have been uſed to read in the *Church*; but in the ſtrict ſenſe for ſuch as are a good *Foundation* to build matters of Faith upon.

2. That theſe Books were not ſo received by all even in the *Council* of *Trent*. For what is received by virtue of a *Catholick Tradition*, muſt be univerſally received by the account given by both the Hiſtorians. *F. Paul* ſaith, *that in the Congregation there were two different Opinions of thoſe who were for a particular Catalogue; one was to diſtinguiſh the Books into three parts, the other to make all the Books of equal authority; and that this latter was carried by the greater number.* Now if this were a *Catholick Tradition*, how was it poſſible for the Fathers of the Council to divide about it? And Cardinal *Pallavicini* himſelf ſaith, *that* Bertanus *and* Seripandus *propounded the putting the Books into ſeveral Claſſes, ſome to be read for Piety, and others to confirm Doctrines of Faith*; and *that Cardinal* Seripando *wrote a moſt learned Book to that purpoſe.* What! againſt a *Catholick Tradition?* It ſeems, he was far from believing it to be ſo. And he confeſſes, *that when they came to the Anathema, the Legats and twenty Fathers were for it*; Madrucci *and fourteen were againſt it, becauſe ſome Catholicks were of another opinion.* Then certainly, they knew no *Catholick Tradition* for it.

*Hiſt. of the Council of Tr. l. 2. p. 154.*

*Ibid. l. 6. c. 11. p. 4.*

*p. 8.*

Among theſe Cardinal *Cajetan* is mention'd, *who was*, ſaith *Pallavicini*, *ſeverely rebuked for it by* Melchior Canus; but what is that to the *Tradition* of the Church? *Canus* doth indeed appeal to the Council of *Carthage*, *Innocentius* I. and the Council of *Florence*; but this doth not make up a *Catholick Tradition* againſt *Cajetan*; who declares that he follows S. *Jerom*, who caſt thoſe Books out of the *Canon* with Reſpect to Faith. And he anſwers the Arguments brought on the other ſide, by this diſtinction, that they are *Canonical for Edification, but not for Faith.* If therefore *Canus* would have confuted *Cajetan* he ought to have proved that they were owned for *Canonical* in the latter Senſe. *Cajetan* in his Epiſtle to *Clemens* VII. before the Hiſtorical Books, owns the great Obligation of the Church to S. *Jerom* for diſtinguiſhing *Canonical and Apocryphal Books*; and ſaith, *that he hath freed it from the Reproach of the Jews, who ſaid the Chriſtians made Canonical Books of the Old Teſtament which*

*Can. Lec. Theol. l. 2. c. 11.*

*Cajet. in Eccleſ. fine. Ad* Eſter *c. 10. ad fin.*

*which they knew nothing of.* And this was an Argument of great conſequence; but *Canus* takes no notice of it, and it fully anſwers his Objection, *that Men could not know what Books were truly Canonical*, viz. ſuch as were of *Divine Inſpiration, and ſo received by the Jews. Catharinus* ſaith, in Anſwer to *Cajetan, that the Jews had one Canon, and the Church another.* But how comes the Canon to be received as of *divine Inſpiration* which was not ſo received among the Jews? This were to reſolve all into the Churches *Inſpiration*, and not into *Tradition.* *Annot. in* Cajet. *l.* 1. *p.* 37.

*Bellarmine* grants, *that the Church can by no means make a Book Canonical, which is not ſo, but onley declare what is Canonical, and that, not at pleaſure; but from ancient Teſtimonies, from ſimilitude of ſtyle with Books uncontroverted, and the general Senſe and Taſte of Chriſtian People.* Now the Caſe here relates to Books not firſt written to Chriſtians, but among the *Jews* from whom we receive *the Oracles of God committed to them.* And if the *Jews* never believed theſe Books to contain *the Oracles of God* in them, how can the Chriſtian Church embrace them for ſuch, unleſs it aſſumes a Power to make, and not merely to declare Canonical Books? For he grants we have no Teſtimony of the *Jews* for them. *De Verb. Dei, l.* 1. *c.* 11.

But *Catharinus* himſelf cannot deny *that S.* Jerom *ſaith, that although the Church reads thoſe Books, yet it doth not receive them for Canonical Scriptures.* And he makes a pitiful Anſwer to it. For he confeſſes, *that the Church, taken for the Body of the Faithful, did not receive them; but, as taken for the Governors, it did.* But others grant that they did receive them no more than the People; and as to the other, the cauſe of Tradition is plainly given us. And in truth he reſolves all at laſt into the opinion of the Popes *Innocentius, Gelaſius* and *Eugenius* IV. But we are obliged to him for letting us know the Secret of ſo much zeal for theſe *Apocryphal Books*, viz. *that they are of great force againſt the Hereticks, for Purgatory is no where ſo expreſly mention'd as in the Maccabees.* If it had not been for this, S. *Jerom* and *Cajetan* might have eſcaped Cenſure, and the *Jewiſh Canon* had been ſufficient. Jul. Ruger. *de libris Canonicis, p.* 80. *p.* 41.

But to ſhew, that there hath been no *Catholick Tradition* about the *Tridentine Canon*, I ſhall prove theſe two things:

1. That there hath been a *conſtant Tradition againſt it* in the *Eaſtern Church.*

2. That there never was a *conſtant Tradition* for it in the *Weſtern Church.*

1. That there hath been a *conſtant Tradition againſt it in the Eaſtern Church*, which received the *Jewiſh Canon*, without the Books declared *Canonical* by the *Council* of *Trent.* We have very early Evidence of this, in the Teſtimony of *Melito* Biſhop of *Sardis*, who lived not long after the middle of the 2d. Century, and made it his buſineſs to enquire into this matter, and *he delivers but 22 Books of the Old Teſtament.* The ſame is done by *Origen* in the next, who took infinite Pains, as *Euſebius* ſaith, in ſearching after the *Copies* of the Old Teſtament. And theſe Teſtimonies are preſerved by *Euſebius* in the following Century; and himſelf declares, *that there was no ſacred Book among the Jews from the time of* Zorobabel; which cuts off the Books Canonized by the Council of *Trent.* In the ſame Age we have the Teſtimonies of *Athanaſius*, St. *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem*, *Epiphanius*, S. *Baſil*, S. *Gregory Nazianzene*, *Amphilochius* and S. *Chryſoſtom:* It is not to be imagined that a *Tradition* ſhould be better atteſted in one Euſeb. *l.* 4. *c.* 25. *l.* 6. *c.* 25. *Philocal. c.* 3.

Euſeb. *Demonſtr. l.* 8. *p.* 368. *Chronic. Gr. p.* 172. Athanaſ. *Ep* 39. Cyril. *Catech.* 4. Epiph. *de menſuris & ponder.* Baſil. *in* Origen. *Philocal.* Greg. Nazianzen. *in Carm.* Amph. *in canon. Ep. apud* Balſam. *S.* Chryſoſt. *in Gen. hom.* 4.

Age

Age than this was, by ſo conſiderable Men in different Churches, who give in the Teſtimony of all thoſe Churches they belonged to. And yet beſides theſe we have in that Age a concurrent Teſtimony of a Council of Biſhops at *Laodicea*, from *ſeveral Provinces* of *Aſia*; and which is yet more, this *Canon* of theirs was received into the *Code* of the *Catholick Church*; and ſo owned by the Council of *Chalcedon*, which by its firſt Canon gives Authority to it. And *Juſtinian* allows the force of *Laws* to the *Canons* which were either made or confirmed by the four *General Councils*. But it is the point of *Tradition* I am upon; and therefore *Juſtinian*'s *Novel* may at laſt be a ſtrong Evidence of that in the 6th Century. In the 7th *Leontius* gives his own Teſtimony, and that of *Theodorus*. In the 8th *Damaſcen* expreſly owns the *Hebrew Canon* of 22 *Books*, and excludes by name ſome of the Books made *Canonical* at *Trent*. In the 9th we have the Teſtimony of *Nicephorus*, *Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople*, if he be the Author of the *Laterculus*, at the end of his *Chronography*; but if he be not, he muſt be an Author of that Age, being tranſlated by *Anaſtaſius Bibliothecarius*. In the 12th *Balſamon* and *Zonaras* refer to the Council of *Laodicea*, and the *Greek Fathers*. In the 14th *Nicephorus Caliſthus* reckons but 22 *Books of the Old Teſtament*. And in this Age, we have the clear Teſtimony of *Metrophanes*, (afterwards Patriarch of *Alexandria*) who ſaith, *there are but* 22 *Canonical Books of the Old Teſtament*; *but the reſt*, i. e. *Tobit*, *Judith*, *Wiſdom*, *Eccleſiaſticus*, *Baruch* and *Maccabees are uſeful*, *and therefore not wholly to be rejected*, *but the Church never received them for Canonical and Authentical*, *as appears by many Teſtimonies*, *as*, *among others of* Gregory *the Divine*, Amphilochius *and* Damaſcen: *and therefore we never prove matters of Faith out of them.*

*Conc.* Laodicea, *c*, 59.

*Novell.* 131.

Leont. *de Sectis Act.* 2. Damaſcen. *de Fide*, *l.* 4. *c.* 18. Niceph. *Chronogr. p.* 419. Anaſtaſ. *Hiſt. p.* 189. *Not. in Can.* 27. Carthag. Niceph. *in Epigram.* Meircph. *Confeſſ. c.* 7. *p.* 82. Phil. Cyprii *Chronic. Eccleſ. Græc. p.* 459.

2. Let us now compare this *Tradition* with that of the *Weſtern Church* for the *New Canon* of *Trent*. It cannot be denied, that *Innocentius* I. and *Gelaſius* did enlarge the Canon, and took in the *Apocryphal Books* (unleſs we call in queſtion the Writings under their Names;) but granting them genuine, I ſhall ſhew that there is no compariſon between this *Tradition* and that of the *Eaſtern Church*, and therefore there could be no poſſible Reaſon for the Council of *Trent* to make a Decree for this *Tradition*, and to *Anathematize* all who did not ſubmit to it. For,

1. This *Tradition* was not *univerſally* received at that time. *Innocentius* his Epiſtle is ſuppoſed to be written *A. D.* 405. Was the Weſtern Church agreed before or after about this matter? This Epiſtle was written to *Eruperius*, a Gallican Biſhop, (to whom S. *Jerom* dedicated his his Commentaries on *Zechariah*,) but now it unluckily falls out, that the *Tradition* of the *Gallican Church* was contrary to this; as appears by S. *Hilary*, (who could not be ignorant of it, being a famous Biſhop of that Church) and he tells us, *there were but* 22 *Canonical Books of the old Teſtament*. I confeſs ſaith he, *ſome were for adding* Tobit *and* Judith, but it is very obſervable that he ſaith, *that the other Account is moſt agreeable to ancient Tradition*, which is a mighty Argument againſt *Innocentius*, who brings no Tradition to juſtifie his Canon. When St. *Auguſtin* produced a Place out of the Book of *Wiſdom*, the Divines of *Marſeilles* rejected it; *becauſe the Book was not Canonical:* Therefore in that time *Innocent*'s Cannon was by no means received in the *Gallican Church*; for by it this Book was made *Canonical*. But S. *Jerom* who had as much learning as Pope *Innocent*, vehemently oppoſed this *New Canon*, more than once or ten times; and not only ſpeaks of the *Jewiſh Canon*, but of the *Canon of the Church*. *The Church*, ſaith he, *reads the Books of* Tobit,

Hilar. *Prolog. in* Pſalm.

*De Prædeſt. Sanctor. c.* 14.

*Prolog.* Gal. *Prolog. in lib.* Salom. *ad* Paul. *&* Euſt. *ad* Chromat.

Tobit, Judith *and* Macchabees, *but the Church doth not receive them among Canonical Scriptures.* What *Church* doth he mean? Not the *Synagogue* certainly. Pope *Innocent* saith, *Thoſe Books are to be received into the Canon*; S. *Jerom* saith, *The Church doth not receive them, but that they are to be cast out*; Where is the Certainty of Tradition to be found? If *Innocent* were in the right, S. *Jerom* was foully miſtaken, and in plain terms belied the Church. But how is this conſiſtent with the *Saintſhip* of S. *Jerom?* Or with common Diſcretion, if the Church did receive thoſe Books for Canonical? For every one could have diſproved him. And it required no great Judgment or deep Learning to know what Books were received, and what not. If S. *Jerom* were ſo miſtaken (which it is very hard to believe) how came *Ruffinus* not to obſerve his Errors and Oppoſition to the Church? Nay, how came *Ruffinus* himſelf to fall into the very ſame prodigious Miſtake? For he not only rejects the controverted Books out of the *Canon*, but saith, *he follow'd the ancient Tradition therein.* What account can be given of this matter? If *Innocent's* Tradition were right, theſe Men were under a groſs Deluſion; and yet they were learned and knowing Perſons, and more than ordinarily converſant in the *Doctrines and Tradition* of the Church.

Ruffin. *in Symbol. p.* 188, 189.

2. This Opinion was not received as a *Tradition* of the *Church* afterwards. For, if it had been, how could *Gregory* I. reject the Book of *Macchabees* out of the *Canon*, when two of his Predeceſſors took it in? It is ſomewhat hard, to ſuppoſe one Pope to contradict two of his Predeceſſors about the *Canon of Scripture*; yet I ſee not how to avoid it; nor how it is conſiſtent with the *Conſtancy* of *Tradition*, much leſs with the pretence to *Infallibility.* He did not *merely doubt*, as *Canus* would have it thought, but he plainly excludes them out of the Canon. *Catharinus* thinks *he followed S.* Jerom. What then? Doth this exclude his contradicting his Predeceſſors? Or was S. *Jerom's* Judgment above the Pope's? But it was not S. *Gregory* alone who contradicted the former *Pope's Canon*; for it was not received either in *Italy*, *Spain*, *France*, *Germany* or *England*; and yet no doubt it was *a very Catholick Tradition.*

Greg. *Moral. in* Job. *l.* 19. *c.* 17.

Can. *Loc. Theol. l.* 2. *c.* 11. *ad* 4. Cath. *de Canonicis Scrip. in Opuſcul. p.* 302.

Not in *Italy*; for there *Caſſiodore*, a learned devout Man in the next Century to them, gives an account of the Canon of Scripture, and he takes not any notice either of *Innocent* or *Gelaſius.* He firſt ſets down the Order of Scripture according to S. *Jerom*; and then according to S. *Auguſtin*; and in the laſt place, according to the old Tranſlation and the *LXX.* and where himſelf ſpeaks of the *Apocryphal Books* before, he follows *S.* Jerom's *Opinion, that they were written rather for manners than Doctrine.* He confeſſes there was a difference about *the Canon*; but he goes about to excuſe it. But what need that, if there were a *Catholick Tradition* then in the Church concerning it, and that inforced by two Popes?

Caſſiodor. *de Inſtit. Divin. liter. c.* 12, 13, 14. *c.* 6.

But it may yet ſeem ſtrange, that even in *Italy*, one canonized for a Saint by *Clemens* VII. ſhould follow S. *Jerom's* Opinion in this matter, *viz.* S. *Antonius*, Biſhop of *Florence.* Who ſpeaking of *Eccleſiaſticus* received into the Canon of the two Popes, he ſaith, *it is only received by the Church to be read, and is not authentick to prove any thing in matters of Faith.* He that writes Notes upon him, ſaith, *that he follows S.* Jerom, *and muſt be underſtood of the Eaſtern Church*; *for the Weſtern Church always received theſe Books into the Canon.* But he ſpeaks not one word of the *Eaſtern Church*; and by the *Church* he could underſtand nothing but

S. Antonin. *Sum. Hiſt. P.* 1. *Tit.* 3. *c.* 4.

*Can. Loc. Theol. l. 2. c. 11.* what he accounted the *Catholick Church*. *Canus* allows *Antonius to have rejected these Books; but he thinks the matter not so clear, but then they might doubt concerning it.* Then there was no such Evidence of *Tradition* to convince Men. But *Antonius* hath preserved the Judgment of a great Man concerning these Books, even *Thomas Aquinas*, who *in* 2. 2^dæ. *Part.* 3. *Tit.* 18. *c.* 6 *Sect.* 2, & 3. he saith, *denied these Books to have such authority as to prove any matter of Faith by them*: which is directly contrary to the Council of *Trent*. If this passage be not now to be found in him, we know whom to blame for it. If *Antonius* saw it there, we hope his word may be taken for it.

In *Spain*, we have, for the Hebrew Canon, the Testimonies of *Paulus Burgensis*, *Tostatus*, and Cardinal *Ximines*. Bur. *in Addit. ad* Lyram *ad c.* 1. Ester. & 7. Tostat. *in* Matt. *Præf. q.* 1, 2. Xim. *Præf. ad Bib. Comp.*

In *France* of *Victorinus*, *Agobardus*, *Radulphus Flaviacensis*, *Petrus Cluniacensis*, *Hugo de S. Victore*, and *Richard de S. Victore*, *Lyra*, *&c.*

In *Germany*, of *Rabanus Maurus*, *Strabus*, *Rupertus*, *Hermannus Contractus*, and others.

In *England* of *Bede*, *Alcuin*, *Sarisburiensis*, *Ockam*, *Waldensis*, and others. Whom I barely mention, because their Testimonies are at large in Bishop *Cosins* his *Scholastical History of the Canon of Scripture*, and no Man hath yet had the hardiness to undertake that Book.

These I think are sufficient to shew there was no *Catholick Tradition* for the Decree of the Council of *Trent* about the *Canon* of *Scripture*.

I now proceed to shew on what pretences and colours it came in, and by what degrees and steps it advanced.

1. The first step was, the Esteem which some of the Fathers expressed of these Books in quoting of passages out of them. We do not deny that the Fathers did frequently cite them; even those who expressly rejected them from being *Canonical*, and not as ordinary Books, but as such as were useful to the Church, wherein many wise Sayings and good Actions are recorded. But the many Quotations the Fathers do make out of them is the onely plausible pretence which those of the Church of *Rome* have to defend the putting them into the Canon, as appears by *Bellarmine* and others. The Book of *Tobit*, they tell us, is mentioned by S. *Cyprian*, S. *Ambrose*, St. *Basil*, and St. *Augustin*. Of *Judith*, by St. *Jerom*, who mentions *a Tradition that it was allowed in the Council of* Nice; but certainly S. *Jerom* never believed it, when he declares it to be *Apocryphal*, and not sufficient to prove any matter of Faith. The Book of *Wisdom*, by S. *Cyprian*, S. *Cyril* and S. *Augustin*. *Ecclesiasticus*, by *Clemens Alexandrinus*, S. *Cyprian*, *Epiphanius*, S. *Ambrose*, S. *Augustin*. But all these Testimonies only prove that they thought something in those Books worth alledging, but not that they judged the Books themselves *Canonical*. And better arguments from their Citations might be brought for the Books of the *Sibylls*, than for any of these. We are not then to judge of their Opinion of *Canonical Books* by bare Citations, but by their declared Judgments about them.

2. The next step was, when they came to be read in Churches; but about this there was no certain Rule. For the Councils of *Laodicea* and *Carthage* differted chiefly upon this Point. The former decreed, *That none but Canonical Scripture should be read under the Name of Holy Writings*; and set down the names of the *Canonical Books then to be read*, (and so leaves out the *Apocalypse.*) The latter, *from their being read, infer'd their being Canonical*; for it agrees with the other, *that none but Canonical should be read*, and because these were read, it reckons them up with the *Canonical Books*; for so the Canon concludes, *We have received from our Fathers that these Books are to be read in Churches.* But

But the Council of *Carthage* was not peremptory in this matter; but desired *it might be referred to* Boniface *and other Bishops beyond the Seas*: Which shews that here was no Decree absolutely made, nor any *Certainty* of *Tradition*; for then to what purpose should they send to other Churches to advise about it?

3. When they came to be distinguished from *Apocryphal Writings*. Whence those who do not consider the Reason of it, conclude them to have been *Canonical*. But sometimes *Apocryphal* signified such Books as were not in *the Canon of Faith*, as in the Authors before mentioned; sometimes such Books which *were not allowed to be used among Christians*. This distinction we have in *Ruffinus*, who saith there are three sorts of Books; *Canonical*, as *the 22 of the Old Testament*; *Ecclesiastical*, of which sort he reckons *Wisdom*, *Ecclesiasticus*, *Tobit*, *Judith* and *Maccabees*, and these he saith *were permitted to be read in Churches*, but no Argument could be brought out of them for matter of Faith; *Apocryphal* are such *which by no means were permitted to be read*. And thus *Innocentius* his words may well be understood: For he concludes with saying, *that other Writings were not only to be rejected, but to be condemned*. And so his meaning is to distinguish them from such *counterfeit Divine Writings* as were then abroad. For these were not to be wholly rejected, and in that large sense he admits them into the *Canon*, taking *Ecclesiastical Writings* which were read in Churches into that number. And in this sense S. *Austin* used the Word *Apocryphal*, when the Book of *Enoch* is so called by him, and such other *counterfeit Writings* under the Names of the *Prophets and Apostles*; but elsewhere he distinguishes between the *Canonical Books of* Solomon, *and those which bear his Name*; which he saith *the more learned know not to be his, but the Western Church had of old owned their Authority*. But in the case of the Book of *Enoch*, he appeals to the *Canon*, which *was kept in the Jewish Temple*; and so falls in with *S. Jerom*; and he confesses it is hard to justifie the Authority of those which are not in the *Hebrew Canon*. Of the *Maccabees* he saith, *It is distinguished from the Writings called Canonical*; *but it is received by the Church as such*. What! to confirm matters of faith? No, But *for the glorious sufferings therein recorded*; and elsewhere he saith, *it is useful, if it be soberly read*. S. *Austin* knew very well that all Books were not received alike; and that many were received in some parts of the Western Church from the old Translation out of the *LXX*, which were not received in the *Eastern*; and therefore in his Books of *Christian Doctrine* he gives Rules in judging of *Canonical Books*; to follow *the Authority of the greatest Number of Catholick Churches, especially the Apostolical*; *and that those which were received by all, should be preferred before those which were only received by some*. But he very well knew, that the Hebrew Canon was universally received, and that the controverted Books were not; and therefore, according to his Rule, these could never be of Equal Authority with the other.

Aug. *de Civ. Dei. l.* 15. *c.* 23. *l.* 17. *c.* 20

Aug. *de Civ. Dei, l.* 18. *c.* 36.

C. Gaudent. *c.* 29.

*De Doctr. l.* 3. *c.* 8.

4. When the Roman Church declared that it received the controverted Books into the *Canon*. This is said to have been done by *Gelasius*, with his *Synod of LXX Bishops*, (and yet it is hard to understand how *Gregory* so soon after should contradict it.) This Title of it in the old MS. produced by *Chifletius*, and by him attributed to *Hormisdas*, is *The Order of the Old Testament which the Holy Catholick Roman Church receives and honours is this*. But whether by *Gelasius*, or *Hormisdas*, I cannot understand, why such a Decree as this should not be put into the

*Not. in* Vigil. Tapf. *p.* 150.

old *Roman Code* of *Canons*, if it had been then made. That there was such a one appears by the Copies of it in the *Vatican*, mention'd by the *Roman* Correctors of *Gratian*, and by mention of it by the Canon of *Si Romanorum. Dist.* 19. and *De Libellis Dist.* 20. and by the latter we understand what Canons of Councils, and Decrees of Popes are in it, among whom are both *Gelasius* and *Hormisdas.* This they agree to be the same with that publish'd by *Wendelstin* at *Mentz*, 1525. The Epistle of *Innocentius* to *Exuperius*, with the Canon, is there publish'd, but not the other; and so is the Canon of the Council of *Carthage*; but that of *Laodicea* is cut off; and so they are in that publish'd by *Dionysius Exiguus* and *Quesnell*, (*Justellus* his ancient Copy was imperfect there,) but both these Canons being in the *Roman Code*, are an Argument to me, that the controverted Books were receiv'd by the *Roman Church* at that time; but in such a manner, that S. *Jerom*'s Prologues still stood in the *vulgar Latin Bible*, with the Commentaries of *Lyra*, and Additions of *Burgensis*, which were stiff for the *Hebrew Canon*; and S. *Jerom*'s Authority prevailed more than the Pope's, as appears fully by what hath been already produced.

5. To advance the Authority of these Books one step higher, *Eugenius* IV. declar'd them to be *Part of the Canon* in the Instruction given to the *Armenians.* Which the *Roman* Writers pretend to have been done in the Council of *Florence:* But *Naclantus* Bishop of *Chioza*, in the Council of *Trent*, as *Pallavicini* saith, *deny'd that any such Decree was made by the Council of* Florence; *because the last Session of it ended* 1439. *and that Decree was signed* Feb. 4. 1441. To this the Legat reply'd, *That this was a Mistake occasion'd by* Abraham Cretensis, *who publish'd the Latin Version of it, only till the Greeks Departure; but the Council continu'd three Years longer, as appear'd by the Extracts of* Augustinus Patritius, since publish'd in the Tomes of the Councils. But he never mentions the *Canon of Scripture*; however, because *Cervinus* affirms, That he saw the Original signed by the Pope and Cardinals, we have no reason to dispute it. But then it appears how very little it signified, when *Antonius* the Bishop of *Florence* opposed it, and Cardinal *Ximenes*, and Cardinal *Cajetan* slighted it, and all who embraced the Council of *Basil* looked on *Eugenius* his Decree as void; and after all, that very Decree only joins the *Apocryphal Books* in the *same Canon*, as the *Council* of *Carthage* had done; but it was reserved as the peculiar Honour of the *Council* of *Trent* to declare, *that Matters of Faith might be proved out of them, as well as out of any Canonical Scriptures.*

*Hist. Concil.* Trident. *l.* 6. *c.* 11. *n.* 12.

## III. About the Free Use of the Scripture in the vulgar Language, prohibited by the Council of Trent.

To understand the Sense of the Council of *Trent* in this matter, we must consider,

1. *That it declares the vulgar Latin to be Authentick*; i. e. *that no Man under any Pretence shall dare to presume to reject it.* Suppose the Pretence be, that it differs from the Original; no matter for that, he must not reject that which the Council hath declared Authentick, *i. e. among the Latin Editions.* But suppose a Man find other Latin Translations truer in some Parts, because they agree more with the Original Text, may he therein reject the vulgar Latin? By no means, if he thinks himself bound to adhere to the Council of *Trent. But the Council supposes it to*

*agree*

*agree with the Original.* And we must believe the Council therein. This is indeed the meaning of the Council, as far as I can judge. But what Catholick Tradition was there for this? *Yes, for a thousand Years after* Gregory's *Time.* But this is not Antiquity enough to found a *Catholick Tradition* upon. If there were no more than a Thousand from *Gregory*, there were Six Hundred past before him; so that there must be a more ancient Tradition in the Church, wherein this Version was not *Authentick*; and how came it then to be *Authentick* by virtue of *Tradition*? Here then Tradition must be given up; and the Council of *Trent* must have some other Ground to go upon. For I think the Traditionary Men will not maintain the *vulgar Latin* to have been always *Authentick.*

2. That it referred the *making the Index of prohibited Books to the Pope*; and in the 4th *Rule* of that *Index*, *All Persons are forbidden the Use of the Scripture in the vulgar Tongue, without a particular License, and whosoever presumes to do it without a Faculty, unless he first gives up his Bible, he is not to receive Absolution.*

My Business is now to enquire what *Catholick Tradition* the Pope and Council went upon in this *Prohibition.* But as to the Testimony of Fathers, I am prevented by some late Discourses on this Subject. Instead thereof therefore I shall,

1. Shew, from their own Writers, that there could be *no Catholick Tradition* for such a Prohibition.

2. Prove the General Consent of the Catholick Church from publick Acts, as to the free Use of the Scripture.

*Thomas Aquinas* grants, *that the Scripture was proposed to all, and in such a manner, that the most Rude might understand it.* Therefore there was no Prohibition of such Persons reading it. *Sum. q. 1. a. 9.*

*Cajetan* there uses two Arguments for the Scriptures using *Metaphors and Similitudes.* 1. *Because God provides for all*; 2. *Because the Scripture is tendred to all. And the Common People are not capable of understanding Spiritual Things without such Helps.* If the Scriptures were intended for all, how comes a Prohibition of the Use of it?

*Sixtus Senensis* grants, *That in former Times the Scripture was translated into the vulgar Languages, and the People did commonly read it, to their great Benefit.* Then a Prohibition of it must alter the Churches practical Tradition. Sixt. Senens. *Bilioth. l. 6. n. 152.*

*Alphonsus à Castro* yields to *Erasmus, that the Scriptures were of old Translated into the vulgar Tongues, and that the Fathers, such as S.* Chrysostom, *and S.* Jerom, *persuaded People to the reading them; but the Case is altered now, when such Mischief comes by the Reading the Scriptures.* And yet the Tradition of the Church continues the same, and is impossible to be changed. Alphons. à Castro, *l. 1. c. 13.*

*Azorius* puts the Case fairly; he grants *that the Scriptures were at first written and publish'd in the Common Language*; that *S.* Chrysostom *admits all to read the Scriptures*; *and that the People did so then, but they do not now.* But he saith *the People then understood Greek and Latin, and now they do not.* If it were their own Language they might well understand it, but why should not the Scripture now be in a Language they may understand? For *Greek* and *Latin* did not make the *common People* one jot wiser or better; and this Man calls it *a Heresie now to say the Scriptures ought to be translated into our vulgar Languages.* How much is the Faith of the Church changed? Azor. *Instit. Moral. l. 8. c. 26.*

I am

2. I am now to prove the General Consent of the Catholick Church in this Matter from *Publick Acts*, *i. e.* that all Parts of it have agreed in *Translations* of *Scripture* into *vulgar Languages* without any such *Prohibition*.

If there had been any such thing in the Primitive Church, it would have held against the *Latin Translation* it self. For I hope none will say it was the *Original*, however *Authentick* it be made by the Council of *Trent*. How then came the Originals to be turned into the common Language? (as I suppose *Latin* will be allow'd to have been the common Language of the Roman Empire.) There is no Objection can now be made against any modern Translations, but would have held against the first *Latin Version*. Who the Author of it was is utterly unknown; and both S. *Augustin* and S. *Jerom* say, *There was a great Variety among the old Translations, and every one Translated as he thought fit*. So that there was no Restraint laid upon Translating into the common Language. And unless *Latin* were an infallible Guide to those that understood it, the People were as liable to be deceived in it, as either in *English* or *French*.

Aug. *de Doct. Christian. l.* 2. *c.* 11. Hier. *Præf. in* Josuam.

But it was not only thus in the *Roman Empire*, but where-ever a People were converted to Christianity in all the elder Times, the Scripture was turned into their Language. The Ecclesiastical Historians mention the *Conversion* of the *Goths*, and upon that, the *Translation of the Bible into their Language by* Ulphilas *their Bishop*. *Walafridus Strabo* adds to this, *That besides the Bible, they had all Publick Offices of of Religion performed in their own Language*.

Socr. *l.* 4. *c.* 33. Soz. *l.* 6. *c.* 37. Nicep. *l.* 11. *c.* 48. Ifid. *in Chron.* Gothorum. Walaf. Strab. *de Reb. Eccl. c.* 7.

How soon the Churches in *Persia* were planted, it is impossible for us now to know; but in the *MS. Eccleasistical History of Abulpharagius* (in the Hands of Dr. *Mostus*) it is said, *that a Disciple of* Thaddæus *preached the Gospel in* Persia, Assyria, *and the Parts thereabouts*; *and that by another Disciple of his*, 360 *Churches were settled there in his time*; *and that he came to* Seleucia, *the Metropolis of the* Persians, *and there establish'd a Church, where he continued fifteen Years*. And from him there was a Succession of the Patriarchs of *Seleucia*, which continues still in the East; for upon Destruction thereof by *Almansor*, they removed first to *Bagdad*, and after that to *Moval* over against *Niniveh*, where their Residence hath been since; and this Patriarch had universal Jurisdiction over the *Eastern Churches* as far as the *East Indies*, as appears by *Morinus* his Books of *Ordinations* in the *East*, and the *Proceedings* with the Christians of S. *Thomas* in the very End of the *last Century*.

But we are certain from the *Greek* Historians, that in *Constantine*'s Time, the Christians in *Persia* were so numerous that he wrote to the King of *Persia* on their Behalf. *Eusebius* saith, that *Constantine* was informed, *that the Churches were much increased there, and great Multitudes were brought into Christ's Flock*; and *Constantine* himself, in his Letter to *Sapores*, saith, *the Christians flourished in the best Parts of* Persia; *and he hoped that they might continue so to do*. But after *Constantine*'s Death, a terrible Persecution befel them, wherein *Sozomen* saith, *the Names of* 16000 *Martyrs were preserved, besides an innumerable Multitude of unknown Persons*. The sharpest Part of the Persecution fell upon the *Bishops* and *Presbyters*, especially in *Adiabene*, which was almost wholly Christian, which *Ammianus Marcellinus* saith, was the same with *Assyria*, wherein were *Nineveh Ecbatane*, *Arbella*, *Gaugamela*, *Babylon* (or *Seleucia*) and *Ctesiphon*, of which *Sozomen* saith, *Symeon* was then Archbishop. And he

Euseb. *de Vit.* Const. *l.* 4. *c.* 8. *c.* 13. Soz. *l.* 2. *c.* 14. *c.* 12. Ammian. Marcell. *l.* 23. Soz. 2. *c.* 9.

names

names above twenty Biſhops who ſuffered beſides, and one *Mareabdes* a *Corepiſcopus*, with 250 of his Clergy. After the time of *Sapores* ſeveral ſharp Perſecutions fell upon thoſe Churches in the Times of *Vararanes* and *Iſdigerdes*, of which the *Greek* Hiſtorians take notice, and one of them, ſaith *Theodoret*, laſted thirty Years. This I mention to ſhew what mean Thoughts thoſe have of the *Catholick Church*, who confine it to the *Roman* Communion. *Theodoret* and S. *Chryſoſtom* both affirm, *that the Perſians had the Scriptures in their own Language*; and *Sozomen* ſaith, *that* Symeon *Archbiſhop of* Seleucia, *and* Cteſiphon *before his own Martyrdom, incouraged the reſt to ſuffer out of the Holy Scriptures.* Which ſuppoſes them well acquainted with the Language of it, and it is not very likely they ſhould be either with the Hebrew, Greek or Latin; but the other Teſtimonies make it clear that it was in their own Tongue.

Theod. *l.* 5. *c.* 39. Theod. *de Cur. Græc. affect. Serm.* 5. *p.* 555. *Serm.* 9. *p.* 6. 15. Chryſ. *in* Joh. *Hom. p.* 561.

The Anonymus Writer of S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Life affirms, *That while he ſtaid in* Armenia, *he cauſed the New Teſtament to be tranſlated into the Armenian Tongue for the Benefit of thoſe Churches.* And this Tradition is allow'd by ſeveral Learned Men in the Church of *Rome*. But the *Armenians* themſelves ſay, *the whole Bible was tranſlated into the Armenian Language by* Moſes Grammaticus, David *and* Mampræus, *three learned Men of their own, in the time of their Patriarch* Iſaac *about S.* Chryſoſtom's *time*. *Thodoret*, in the place already cited, mentions the *Armenian* Tranſlation, as a thing well known; and he was near enough to underſtand the Truth of it.

*Vit.* Chryſ. *c.* 113. *Conc. Eccl.* Armen. *cum* Rom. *c.* 7. *p.* 63.

*Jacobus de Vitriaco*, a Roman Cardinal, ſaith, *That the* Armenians *in his time had the Scriptures read to them in their own Language.*

*Hiſt. Orient. c.* 79.

The *Syriack Verſion* for the Uſe of thoſe in the Eaſtern Parts who underſtood not *Hebrew* or *Greek*, is allow'd by all Learned Men to have been very ancient. I mean, the *old ſimple Verſion* out of the Originals, and not that out of the *LXX.* of the Old Teſtament. As to the New, the Tradition of the Eaſtern People is, *that it was done either in the Apoſtles times, or very near them. Abraham Ecchellenſis* ſhews, from the *Syriack* Writers, *that the compleat Tranſlation of the Bible was made in the time of* Abgarus, *King of* Edeſſa, *by the means of* Thaddæus *and the other Apoſtles*; and as to the time of *Thaddæus*, *Gregorius Malatienſis* confirms it.

Abr. Ecchell. *in* Ebed. Jeſu.

*Poſtellus* quotes an ancient Tradition (which my Adverſaries ought to regard) *that S. Mark himſelf tranſlated not only his own Goſpel, but all the Books of the New Teſtament into the Vulgar Syriack.* It is ſufficient to my purpoſe, to ſhew that there was ſuch an ancient Tranſlation; which is owned by S. *Chryſoſtom*, S. *Ambroſe*, S. *Auguſtin*, *Diodorus* and *Theodoret:* which makes we wonder at Cardinal *Bellarmin*'s affirming with ſo much Confidence, *that none of the Fathers ſpeak of the Syriack Verſion*, when *Theodoret* alone mentions it ſo often in his Commentaries.

Greg. *Hiſt. Dynaſt.* 6.

S. Chryſoſt. *hom.* 2 *in* Joh. Ambroſ. *Hex.* 1. *c.* 8. Aug. *de. Civit. Dei, l.* 15. *c.* 13. Diod. *ad* Gen. 27. 27. Theod. *in* Pſal. 3. 4. *in* Pſal. 103. 26. *in* Pſal. 112. 1. *in* Pſal. 115.

Although the *Greeks* in *Egypt* might very well underſtand the *Greek* of the Old and New Teſtament, (eſpecially if that which is called the *LXX.* were done by the *Alexandrian Jews*, as ſome imagine) yet thoſe who knew no other than the old *Egyptian* Language could not make uſe of it. And therefore *Coptick Tranſlation* was made for them; which *Kircher* thinks to have been 1300 Years old. And he withal obſerves, *that their ancient Liturgies were in the Coptick Language.*

*De Verb. Dei, l.* 2. *c.* 4.

*Prodr. Copt. c.* 8.

That

That it might not be ſuſpected that *Kircher* impoſed upon the World, he gives a particular Account of the Books he had ſeen in the *Vatican Library* and elſewhere in the *Coptick Tongue*. *The Pentateuch in three Tomes, diſtinguiſhed into Paragraphs by Lines. The four Goſpels by themſelves. S.* Paul's *Epiſtles and three Canonical Epiſtles, with the Acts in another Volume. The Apocalypſe by it ſelf, and the Pſalter. The Liturgy of S.* Mark, *with other daily Prayers. The Liturgy of S.* Gregory, *with the Prayers of S.* Cyril *in the Coptick Language; and a Liturgy of S.* Baſil, *with* Gregory *and* Cyril, *with ſeveral other Rituals, Miſſals and Prayers, all in the ſame Tongue. All theſe,* he ſaith, *are in the Vatican Library.*

p. 186. And in that of the *Maronites College*, he ſaith, *is an old Copiick Martyrology about* 1300 *Years ſtanding, by which he finds, that the chief Imployment of the old Egyptian Monks was to tranſlate the Bible out of Hebrew, Caldee and Greek into the Coptick Tongue.*

Diſſert. Epiſt. 13. *Morinus* ſaith, *that in the Oratorian Library at* Paris, *they had the Coptick Goſpels brought from* Conſtantinople *by* Monſr. de Sancy.

Epiſt. 14. *Petrus à Valle*, a Noble Man of *Rome*, and a great Traveller, ſaith, *He had ſeveral parts of Scripture in the Coptick Language, which were turn'd into Arabick, when the old Coptick grew into diſuſe.*

Hottinger. Methurgem. *p.* 189. *Petræus* had in the Eaſtern Parts *a Coptick Pſalter, with an Arabick Verſion, which he deſign'd to publiſh.*

The Congregation *de propaganda Fide* at *Rome* had ſeveral *Coptick MS.* ſent to them out of *Egypt*, among the reſt, the *Coptick Book of Ordination*, Tranſlated and Printed by *Kircher*, and ſince Reprinted by *Morinus*.

*De Ordinat. ſacrũ, p.* 504. *Catal. MSS. p.* 31. *Seguier* the late *Chancellour* of *France*, had in his Library, the *Conſecration* of a Patriarch in *Coptick* and *Arabick*, *and ſeveral Tranſlations of the Bible*, *and Prayers in both Languages.*

Ludolph. *Hiſt. Æthiop. l.* 3. *c.* 4. The *Æthiopick Tranſlation* bears date with the *Conuerſion* of the Nation, according to their own Tradition, which ſome make to be in the *Apoſtolical Times*, and others in the time of *Conſtantine*; and their *Publick Offices* are perform'd in their own Tongue. The Chancellour *Segvier* had not only many parts of the Bible, but *Prayers* and *Offices* in the *Æthiopick Tongue.*

I ſhall add but one thing more to this purpoſe, which is taken from the want of Antiquity in the *Arabick Verſions*; which is confeſſed by the learned Criticks on all ſides. And even this tends to prove my Deſign. For when the *Saracen* Empire prevailed, the People grew more acquainted with the *Arabick* than with tne *Syriack* or *Coptick*; and therefore the Scripture was then tranſlated into *Arabick*; (as *Vaſæus* ſaith it was done in *Spain*, after the Moors came thither by a Biſhop of *Sevil*) and this was the true Reaſon why the *Arabick Verſions* have no greater Antiquity. For *Gabriel Sionita* obſerves, *that the* Arabick *is become the moſt vulgar Language in the Eaſtern Parts.* And becauſe it was ſo in *Syria* as well as *Egypt*, therefore there are different *Arabick Verſions*; the one called *Codex Antiochenus*, and the other *Alexandrinus.*

Gabr. Sionita *de* Arab. *c.* 12.

Thus I have proved that there was a *Catholick Tradition* directly contrary to that eſtabliſhed by order of the Council of *Trent*.

And now I proceed to give an Account of the *Methods* and *Steps* by which this Decree came to its Ripeneſs.

1. The firſt *Step* was the *Declenſion* and *Corruption* of the *Latin Tongue* in the *Weſtern Church*. It is obſerved by *Polybius*, *that from the time of the firſt League between the* Romans *and* Carthaginians, *the Latin Tongue*

Polyb. *l.* 3.

*was*

*was ſo much changed, even in* Rome *it ſelf, that very few could underſtand the Words of it.* And *Feſtus* in *Latinè loqui* ſaith, *that the Language was ſo alter'd, that ſcarce any part of it remain'd entire. Scaliger* thinks *theſe words were added to* Feſtus *by* Paulus Diaconus; which ſeems much more probable ſince he lived in the time of *Charlemagn.* At which time we may eaſily ſuppoſe the *Latin Tongue* to have been very much corrupted by the Writers, and not ſo eaſie to be underſtood any where by the common People in ſudden Diſcourſe, as it had been before. Which appears evident by the *Latin Sermons* made to the People in the ſeveral Provinces of the *Roman Empire*; as in *Africa* by *S. Auguſtin* and *Fulgentius*; in *Italy*, by *Petrus Chryſologus, Laurentius Novarienſis, Gaudentius Brixienſis, Ennodius Ticinenſis*: In *Spain*, by *Iſidore, Ildephonſus* and others: In *Gaul*, by *Cæſarius, Eucherius, Eligius*, and ſeveral others, whoſe Latin Sermons to the People, are ſtill extant. In the Council of *Tours*, in the time of *Charlemagn*, particular Care is taken *that the Homilies ſhould be tranſlated by their Biſhops either into the Ruſtick Roman, or the German, that the People might the eaſier underſtand them.* Theſe Homilies were either thoſe which *Charlemagn* cauſed to be taken out of the Fathers, and apply'd to the ſeveral Leſſons through the Year, as *Sigebert* obſerves, or of their own compoſing; however, they were to be turned by the Biſhops either into *Ruſtick Roman*, or *German*, as ſerved beſt to the Capacities of the People. For the *Franks* then either retained the *Original German*, or uſed the *Ruſtick Roman*; but this latter ſo much prevailed over the other, that in the Solemn Oaths between *Lewis* and *Charles* upon parting the Dominions of *France* and *Germany*, ſet down in *Nithardus*, the *Ruſtick Roman* was become the *vulgar Language* of *France*, and theſe were but the Grandchildren of *Charlemagn. Marquardus Freherus* thinks, *that only the Princes and Great Men retained the* German, *but the generality then ſpake the* Ruſtick Roman; as appears by the Oath of the People; which begins thus,

Conc. Turon. 3. c. 17.

Sigeb. *ad An.* 807.

Nithard. *l.* 3.

Freher. *in Expoſit. Fœderis inter* Lud. & Car. *V. Capitul.* Caroli Calvi. *Tit.* 8.

*Si Lodwigs Sacrament que Son Fradre Carlo jurat conſervat, & Carolus meo Serdra de ſuo part uon los tanit, ſi jo returnar non licit pois, ne jo, ne neuls cui eo returnar nil pois, in nulla adjudha contra Lodwig nun li iver.*

By which we may ſee what a mixture of *Latin* there was in the *vulgar Language* then uſed by the *Franks*, and how eaſie it was for the People then to underſtand the *publick Offices* being conſtant; but ther *Sermons* not being ſo, there was greater Neceſſity to turn them into that corrupt or *Ruſtick Roman*, which was thoroughly underſtood by them. In *Spain* the *Latin* wns leſs corrupted, before the *Gothick* and *Arabick*, or *Mooriſh* Words were taken into it. *Lucius Marineus* ſaith, *that had it not been for the Mixture of thoſe words, the* Spaniards *had ſpoke as good Latin as the* Romans *did in the time of* Tully; and he ſaith, *that to his time, he had ſeen Epiſtles written in* Spaniſh, *wherein all the Nouns and Verbs were good Latin.* In *Italy*, the Affinity of the vulgar prevailing Language and *Latin* continued ſo great, that the Difference ſeemed for ſome Hundred Years, no more than of the learned and common *Greek*, or of the *Engliſh* and *Scotch*; and ſo no Neceſſity was then apprehended of tranſlating the correct Tongue into a corrupt Dialect of it.

Marineus Siculus *de Rebus* Hiſp. *l.* 5. *c.* 4.

But where there was a plain Difference of Language there was ſome Care even then taken, that the People might underſtand what they heard, as appears by theſe things,

1. *Alcuinus* gives an Account why one Day was called *Sabbatum in* 12 *Lectionibus*, when there were but *ſix Leſſons*; and he ſaith, *it was*

Alchuin. *de divin. Offic. c.* 29.

*becauſe they were read both in* Greek *and* Latin, *they not underſtanding each others Languages.* Not becauſe the *Greek* was a holy Tongue, but *quia aderant Græci, quibus Ignota erat Lingua Latina*; which ſhews that the Church then thought it a reaſonable Cauſe to have the Scripture in ſuch a Language, which might be underſtood by the People. The ſame Reaſon is given by *Amalarius.*

Amalar. *de Offic. l.* 2. *c.* 1.

2. In the *German* Churches there were ancient Tranſlations of Scripture into their own Language. *B. Rhenanus* attributes a Tranſlation of the Goſpels to *Waldo* Biſhop of *Freiſing, as ſoon as the* Franks *received Chriſtianity*; and he ſaith; *It was the immortal Honour of the* Franks, *to have the Scripture ſo ſoon tranſlated into their own Language*; *which*, ſaith he, *is of late oppoſed by ſome Divines:* So little did he know of an univerſal Tradition againſt it. *Goldaſtus* mentions the Tranſlation in Rhime by *Ottfridus Wiſſenburgenſis*, publiſh'd by *Achilles Gaſſarus*, the Pſalter of *Notkerus*, *Rudolphus ab Eems* his *Paraphraſe* of the *Old Teſtament*. *Andreas du Cheſn* hath publiſh'd a Preface before an old *Saxon Book*, wherein it is ſaid, *that* Ludovicus Pius *did take care that all the People ſhould read the Scripture in their own Tongue, and gave it in charge to a* Saxon *to tranſlate both Old and New Teſtament into the* German *Language*; *which*, ſaith he, *was perform'd very elegantly.*

Rhenan. *Rer.* German. *p.* 112.

*Rer.* Alem. *To.* 1. *p.* 120. *To.* 2. *p.* 119. *Hiſt.* Franc. *To.* 2. *p.* 326.

3. In the *Saxon Churches* here, it was not to be expected that the Scripture ſhould be tranſlated, till there were Perſons learned both in the *Saxon* and the other Languages. *Bede*, in his Epiſtle to *Egbert*, puts him upon inſtructing the common People in their own Language, eſpecially in the Creed and Lord's Prayer; and to further ſo good a Work, *Bede* himſelf tranſlated *the Goſpel of S.* John *into the* Saxon *Tongue*, as *Cuthbert* ſaith in the Epiſtle about his Death, in the Life of *Bede*, before his *Saxon Hiſtory*. It appears by the old Canons of Churches, and the Epiſtles of *Ælfric*, ſaith Mr. *Liſle*, *that there was an old* Saxon *Canon for the Prieſt to ſay unto the People, the Senſe of the Goſpel in* Engliſh; and *Ælfrick* ſaith of himſelf, *that he had tranſlated the* Pentateuch, *and ſome of the Hiſtorical Books.* The New Teſtament was tranſlated by ſeveral Hands; and an ancient *Saxon* Tranſlation hath been lately publiſh'd with the *Gothick* Goſpels. And there were old *Saxon* Gloſſes upon the Goſpels of *Aldred*, *Fermen* and *Owen*. The laſt Work of K. *Alfred* was the Tranſlating the *Pſalter*; and if the MS. Hiſtory of *Ely* deſerves credit, *he tranſlated both the Old and New Teſtament.*

Bed. *Epiſt. ad* Egbert, *p.* 65.

Saxon *Treatiſe of the Old and New Teſtament.*

4. It is not denied either by *Bellarmin* or *Baronius*, *that the* Sclavonians, *in the 9th Century, had a Permiſſion, upon their Converſion to Chriſtianity, to enjoy the Bible, and to have publick Offices perform'd in their own Language.* But they tell us, *it was becauſe they were then Children in the Faith, and to be indulged*; (but methinks Children were moſt in danger to be ſeduc'd;) *or there were not Prieſts enough to officiate in Latin at firſt:* But this was no Reaſon then given, as appears by the Pope's own Letter publiſh'd by *Baronius*, wherein *he gives God Thanks for the Invention of Letters among them by* Conſtantine *a Philoſopher*; and he expreſly ſaith, *that God had not confined his Honour to three Languages, but all People and Languages were to praiſe him*; and he ſaith, *God himſelf in Scripture had ſo commanded*; and he quotes S. *Paul*'s Words for it. One would wonder thoſe great Men ſhould no better conſider the Pope's own Reaſons, but give others for him, which he never thought of. It is true, he adds, *that he would have the Goſpel read firſt in* Latin,

Bell. *de Verbo Dei, l.* 2. Bar. *ad An.* 880. *n.* 16.

*and*

*and then in* Sclavonian, *and if they pleaſed, he would have the Maſs ſaid in* Latin; but the *Sclavonians* continu'd their Cuſtom, and the Pope was willing enough to let them enjoy it, for his own Convenience as well as theirs. For there was a Secret in this Matter, which is not fully underſtood.

*Aventinus* ſaith, *That* Methodius *invented their Letters, and tranſlated the* Scriptures *into the* Sclavonian *Tongue, and perſwaded the People to reject the* Latin Service; but this I ſee no ground for. But the Truth of the matter was, the *Sclavonians* were converted by the Means of *Methodius* and *Cyril*, (otherwiſe called *Conſtantine*) two *Greek Biſhops*, and the Chriſtian Religion was ſettled among them by their Means, and they tranſlated the Scriptures and Offices of Worſhip into their own Language. The Pope had not forgotten the Buſineſs of the *Bulgarians*, and he could not tell but this might end in ſubjection to another *Patriarchal See*; and therefore he endeavours to get *Methodius* and *Cyril* to *Rome*, and having gain'd them, he ſends a ſweetning Letter to the Prince, and makes the Conceſſion beforemention'd. For he could not but remember how very lately the *Greeks* had gain'd the *Bulgarians* from him; and leſt the *Slavonians* ſhould follow them, he was content to let them have what they deſir'd, and had already eſtabliſh'd among themſelves without his Permiſſion. All this appears from the Account of this Matter given by *Conſtantinus Porphyrogenetus*, compared with *Diocleas* his *Regnum Sclavorum*, and *Lucius* his *Dalmatian* Hiſtory.

Aventin. *Annal. l.* 4. *p.* 434.

Bar. *An.* 869. *n.* 80.

It is ſufficient for my Purpoſe, that *Diocleas* owns that *Conſtantine* (to whom *Andreas Dandalus*, D. of *Venice*, in his MS. Hiſtory cited by *Lucius*, ſaith, *The* Pope *gave the Name of* Cyril) *did tranſlate the Bible into the* Sclavonian *Tongue, for the Benefit of the People, and the publick Offices out of* Greek, *according to their Cuſtom.* And the Chancellour *Seguier* had in his Library both the *New Teſtament* and *Liturgies* in the *Sclavonian* Language, and in *Cyril*'s Character; and many of the *Greek Fathers* Commentaries on Scripture in that Tongue, but not one of the Latin.

Luci. *de Regno* Dalmatiæ *l.* 2. *c.* 3.

*Catal. MSS. P.* 33, 34.

2. The next Step was, when *Gregory* VII. prohibited the *Tranſlation* of the *Latin Offices* in the *Sclavonian Tongue*. And this he did to the King of *Bohemia* himſelf, after a peremptory manner; but he ſaith, *It was the Requeſt of the Nobility, that they might have divine Offices in the* Sclavonian *Tongue, which he could by no means yield to.* What was the matter? How comes the Caſe to be ſo much alter'd from what it was in his Predeceſſor's time? The true Reaſon was, the *Bohemian* Churches were then brought into greater Subjection to the *Roman See*, after the Conſecration of *Dithmarus Saxo* to be their Archbiſhop; and now they muſt own their Subjection, as the *Roman* Provinces were wont to do, by receiving the Language. But as his Predeceſſor had found Scripture for it, ſo *Gregory* pretends he had found Reaſon againſt it, *viz. The Scripture was obſcure, and apt to be miſunderſtood and deſpiſed.* What! more than in the time of *Methodius* and *Cyril?* If they plead Primitive Practice, he plainly anſwers, *That the Church is grown wiſer, and hath corrected many things that were then allow'd.* This is indeed to the purpoſe, and therefore by the Authority of S. *Peter, he forbids him to ſuffer any ſuch thing, and charges him to oppoſe it with all his might.*

Greg. *Regiſt. l.* 7. *Ep.* 11.

*Cùm primitiva Eccleſia multa diſſimulaverit quæ à ſanctis Patribus poſtmodum firmata Chriſtianitate, & Religione creſcente, ſubtili examinatione correcta ſunt.*

But after all, it is entred in the Canon Law *De Officio Jud. Ord. l.* 1. *Tit.* 31.

*Tit.* 31. *c. Quoniam.* as a Decree of *Innocent.* III. in the *Lateran Council, that where there were People of different Languages, the Bishop was to provide Persons fit to officiate in those several Languages.* Why so? If there were a Prohibition of using any but the Latin Tongue. *But this was for the* Greeks, *and theirs was an holy Tongue.* That is not said; nor if it were, wou'd it signifie any thing; for doth any imaginary Holiness of the Tongue sanctifie ignorant Devotion? *But the Canon supposes them to have the same Faith.*

Then the meaning is, that no Man must examine his Religion by the Scripture, but if he resolves before-hand to believe as the Church believes, then he may have the Scriptures or Prayers in what Language he pleases. But even this is not permitted in the *Roman* Church. For,

3. After the *Inquisition* was set up by the Authority of *Innocent* III. in the *Lateran Council*, no Lay Persons were permitted to have the Books of the Old and New Testament; but the *Psalter*, or *Breviary*, or *Hours*, they might have; but by no means in the vulgar Language. This is called by *D'achery* and *Labbe*, the *Council* of *Tholouse*, but in truth it was nothing else but an *Order* of the *Inquisition*, as will appear to any one that reads it. And the *Inquisition* ought to have the Honour of it, both in *France* and *Spain*. Which *Prohibition* hath been so grateful to some Divines of the Church of *Rome*, that *Cochlæus* calls it *pious, just, reasonable, wholsome* and *Necessary*; *Andradius* thinks the *taking of it away would be destructive to Faith*: *Ledesma* saith, *The true* Catholicks *do not desire it, and bad ought not to be gratified with it.* *Petrus Sutor*, a *Carthusian* Doctor, calls the Translating Scripture into the vulgar Languages, *a rash, useless and dangerous thing*; and he gives the true Reason of it, *viz. That the People will be apt to murmur when they see things required as from the Apostles, which they cannot find a word of in Scripture.* And when all is said on this Subject that can be, by Men of more Art, this is the plainest and honestest Reason for such a Prohibition; but I hope I have made it appear it is not built on any *Chatholick Tradition.*

Labb. *Concil. To.* 11. *p.* 427.

Cochl. *c.* Alex. Alesium, *A. D.* 1533.
Andrad. *Defens. Concil.* Trident. *l.* 4.
Ledesma *de Div. Script. quavis lingua non leg. p.* 155.
Pet. Sutor *de Tralatione Biblie, p.* 99. *p.* 96.

## IV. Of the Merit of good Works.

The Council of *Trent*, *Sess.* 6. *c.* 16. declares, *That the good Works of justified Persons do truly deserve Eternal Life*; and *Can.* 32. an *Anathema is denounced against him that that denies them to be meritorious, or that a justified Person by them doth not truly merit Increase of Grace, and Happiness, and Eternal Life.*

The Council hath not thought fit to declare what it means by *truly meriting*; but certainly it must be opposed to an improper kind of Meriting, and what that is we must learn from the Divines of the Church of *Rome.*

1. Some say, that some of the Fathers speak of an improper kind of Merit, which is no more than the due Means for attaining of Happiness as the End. So *Vega* confesses they often use the word *Merit*, where there is no Reason for *Merit*, either by way of *Congruity* or *Condignity.* Therefore where there is true Merit, there must be a proper Reason for it. And the Council of *Trent* being designed to condemn some prevailing Opinions at that time, among those they called *Hereticks*, this Assertion of *true Merit* must be levell'd against some Doctrine-

Vega *de Justif. l.* 8. *c.* 8.

ctrine of theirs; but they held *good Works* to be neceſſary as Means to an end, and therefore this could not be the Meaning of the Council.

*Suarez* ſaith, *The Words of the Council ought to be ſpecially obſerv'd; which are, that there is nothing wanting in the good Works of juſtified Perſons,* ut verè promeruiſſe cenſeantur; *and therefore no Metaphorical or improper, but that which by the Senſe of the Church of* Rome *was accounted true Merit, in oppoſition to what was ſaid by thoſe accounted Hereticks muſt be underſtood thereby.* Suarez *de Grat. l.* 12. *c.* 1. *n.* 8.

2. Others ſay, that a mere Congruity ariſing from the Promiſe and Favour of God in rewarding the Acts of his Grace in juſtified Perſons, cannot be the *proper Merit* intended by the Council. And that for theſe Reaſons;

1. *Suarez* obſerves, that altho' the Council avoids the Terms *ex condigno*, yet becauſe it ſtill uſes the words *verè mereri*, it implies ſomething more than *mere Congruity*; and becauſe it ſpeaks of *meriting the Increaſe of Grace, and not the firſt Grace*; now a *Congruity* is allow'd for the *firſt Grace*, which it excludes by mentioning the *Increaſe*. And withal, it brings places to prove, *that the giving the Reward muſt be a Retribution of Juſtice, and if ſo, the Merit muſt be more than that of Congruity.* Suarez *de Grat. l.* 12. *c.* 1. *n.* 12.

2. Becauſe *God's Promiſe* doth not give any *Intrinſick Value* to the Nature of the Act, no more than his Threatning doth increaſe the Nature of Guilt. If the King of *Perſia* had promiſed a Province to him that gave him a Draught of Water, the Act it ſelf had been no more *meritorious*; but it only ſhewed the Munificence of the Prince; no more do God's Promiſes of Eternal Life add any Merit to the Acts of Grace, but only ſet forth the infinite Bounty of the Promiſer.

3. In the Conference at *Ratisbon* (the Year this Decree paſſed by the Emperour's Order) the Proteſtant Party did yield, *that by virtue of God's Promiſe, the Reward of Eternal Life was due to juſtified Perſons; as a Father promiſing a great Reward to his Son for his Pains in ſtudying, makes it become due to him, altho' there be no proportion between them. And if no more were meant by Merit of Congruity, than that it was very agreeable to the Divine Nature to reward the Acts of his own Grace with an infinite Reward, they would yield this too.* *Diſputat.* Ratisbonæ *An.* 1546. *p.* 568.

4. Cardinal *Pallavicini* gives us the plain and true Meaning of the Council, *viz. That a Merit* de Congruo *was allow'd for Works before Juſtification; but for Works after, they all agreed,* he ſaith, *that there was a Merit* de condigno *in them, both for Increaſe of Grace and Eternal Glory.* By Merit *de condigno* is meant ſuch an *Intrinſick Value* in the Nature of the Act, as makes the Reward in Juſtice to be due to it. *Hiſt. Conc.* Trid. *l.* 8. *c.* 4. *n.* 4.

Some call one of theſe, *Meritum ſecundum quid*; which is the ſame with *de congruo*; which really deſerves no Reward, but receives it only from the Liberality of the Giver; and this hath not truly, ſay they, the Notion of Merit; but that which makes the Reward due, is ſimple and true Merit, when it doth not come merely from the Kindneſs of the Giver, but from Reſpect to the Worthineſs of the Action and the Doer, and this is *de condigno*. Rich. *de Media. Vill. in l.* 2. *ſent. diſt.* 17. *art.* 2. *q.* 1. Nich. de Orbellis *in* 3. *ſent. diſt.* 27.

Let us now ſee what *Catholick Tradition* there was for this Doctrine, and whether this were taught them by their Fathers in a continued Succeſſion down from the Apoſtle's times.

But

But that there was a Change, as to the Senſe of the Church in this Matter, I ſhall prove in the firſt place from an Office which was allow'd in the Church before, and forbidden after. It was an *Office*, with reſpect to dying Perſons, wherein are theſe Queſtions.

*Credis non propriis meritis, ſed paſſionis Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti virtute & merito ad gloriam pervenire?*
*Credo.*

Q. *Doſt thou believe that thou ſhalt come to Heaven, not by thy own Merits, but by the Virtue and Merit of Chriſt's Paſſion?*

A. *I do believe it.*

*Credis quod Dominus noſter Jeſus Chriſtus pro Salute noſtra mortus ſit; & quod ex propriis meritis, vel alio modo nullus poſſit ſalvari niſi in merito paſſionis ejus?*
*Credo.*

Q. *Doſt thou believe that Chriſt died for our Salvation, and that none can be ſaved by their own Merits, or any other way but by the Merits of his Paſſion?*

A. *I do believe it.*

Now when the *Indices Expurgatorii* were made, in purſuance to the Order of the *Council* of *Trent*, this Paſſage was no longer endured. For, in the *Roman Index*, the *Ordo Baptizandi*, wherein this Queſtion was, is forbidden till it were corrected. But the *Spaniſh Indices* explain the Myſtery; that of Cardinal *Quiroga* ſaith expreſly, *thoſe Queſtions and Anſwers muſt be blotted out*; and the like we find in the *Index* of *Soto major* and *Sandoval*. What now is the Reaſon, that ſuch Queſtions and Anſwers were no longer permitted, if the Churches Tradition continued ſtill the ſame? Was not this a way to know the Tradition of the Church by the Offices uſed in it? This was no Primitive Office then firſt uſed, but altho' the Prohibition mentions one Impreſſion at *Venice* (as tho' there had been no more) I have one before me, printed by *Gryphius* at *Venice* two Years before that; and long before with the *Præceptorium* of *Lyra*, *Anno Dom.* 1495. where the Queſtion to the dying Perſon is in theſe words, *Si credit ſe Merito Paſſionis Chriſti & non propriis ad gloriam pervenire? Et reſpondeat Credo.* And the ſame Queſtions and Anſwers I have in a *Sacerdotale Romanum*, Printed by *Nicolinus* at *Venice* 1585. Cardinal *Hoſius* ſays, That he had ſeen thoſe Queſtions and Anſwers in the *Sacerdotale Romanum*, and in the *Hortulus Animæ*; and that they were believed to be firſt preſcribed by *Anſelm*, Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*. On what Account now, come theſe things to be prohibited and expunged, if the Churches *Doctrine* and *Tradition* about this matter, be ſtill the very ſame? No doubt it was believed, that the Council of *Trent* had now ſo far declared the Senſe of the Church another way, that ſuch Queſtions and Anſwers were no longer to be endured.

Hoſ *Confeſſ.* Petricovi, *c.* 73. *p.* 144.

*Antididagma* Colon. *f.* 16. 2.

But before the *Council* of *Trent*, the *Canons* of *Colen* againſt *Hermannus* their Biſhop, when he publiſh'd his Reformation, declare, that God's giving Eternal Life upon good Works, is, *ex gratuita dignatione ſuæ clementiæ*, from the Favour which God vouchſafes to them. Which, to my Apprehenſion, is inconſiſtent with the Notion of true Merit in the Works themſelves; for if there be any *Condignity* in them, it cannot be mere Grace and Favour in God to reward them.

*Enchiridi.* Colon. *f.* 176. 2.

The ſame Canons in their *Enchiridion* ſome Years before, when they joyned with their Biſhop, call it *Stupidity*, to think that *good Works* are rewarded with Eternal Life for any Dignity in the Works themſelves. And if there be no Dignity in them, there can be no true Merit; as the *Council* of *Trent* determines with an *Anathema*.

Adrian *de Sacr. Euchar. f.* 61.

Pope *Ardian* VII. gives ſuch an Account of the Merit of our Works, that he could never imagine any Condignity in them to Eternal Life. *For*, ſaith he, *our Merits are a broken Reed, which pierce the Hand of him that*

*that leans upon them; they are a menſtruous Cloth, and our beſt Actions mixt with Impurities; and when we have done all that we can, we are unprofitable Servants.*

*Petrus de Alliaco* Cardinal of *Cambray*, attributes no other Effect to good Works than of a *Cauſa ſine quâ non*; and ſaith, *That the Reward is not to be attributed to any Virtue in them, but to the Will of the Giver.* Which I think overthrows any *true Merit.* Pet. de Alliaco, *in* 4. *l. Sent. q.* 1. *art.* 1. *f.* 255. *c.*

*Gabriel Biel* attributes *the Merit of Good Works* not to any *intrinſical Goodneſs in them*, but to God's Acceptation. Which is in words to aſſert *Merit*, and in truth to deny it; for, how can there be true Merit in the Works, if all their Value depends upon Divine Acceptance? Biel. *in. l.* 2. *ſent. diſſ.* 27. *art.* 1. *not.* 3.

*Thomas Walden* charges *Wickliff* with aſſerting *the Doctrine of Merit, and encouraging Men to truſt in their own Righteouſneſs*; and he quotes Scripture and Fathers againſt it; and he blames the Uſe of the Term of *Merit*, either *ex congruo*, or *ex condigno*: Which he ſaith, *was an Invention of ſome late Schoolmen, and was contrary to the ancient Doctrine of the Church.* As he proves not only from Scripture and Fathers, but from the ancient Offices too; as in the Canon of the Maſs, *Non æſtimator meriti, ſed veniæ quæſumus largitor, &c.* Fer. 4. Paſſ. *Ut qui de meritorum qualitate diffidimus, non judicium tuum ſed miſericordiam conſequamur.* Dom. 2. Adv. *Ubi nulla ſuppetunt ſuffragia meritorum, tuæ nobis indulgentiæ ſuccurre præſidiis.* How comes the Doctrine condemn'd in *Wickliff* to be eſtabliſh'd in the *Council* of *Trent*? For he was blamed for aſſerting *true Merit*, and the Council aſſerts it with an *Anathema* to thoſe that deny it. And yet we muſt believe the very ſame *Tradition* to have been in the Church all this while. Walden. *de Sacram. Tit.* 1. *c.* 7.

*Vega* ſaith, That *Walden* ſpeaks againſt *Merits* without Grace; but any one that reads him, will find it otherwiſe. For he produces thoſe Paſſages out of the Fathers againſt *Merits* which do ſuppoſe *Divine Grace*, as it were eaſie to ſhew; but Friar *Walden* thought the Notion of *Merit* inconſiſtent with the *Power* and *Influence* of *Divine Grace* neceſſary to our beſt Actions. *God*, ſaith he, *doth not regard* Merit, *either as to* Congruity *or* Condignity, *but his own* Grace, *and* Will, *and* Mercy. Vega. *in Opuſ. Qu.* 4.

*Marſilius de Ingen*, who liv'd before *Walden*, reckons up three Opinions about *Merit*; the firſt of thoſe who denied it, and of this, ſaith he, *Durandus* ſeems to be, and one *Joh. de Everbacho.* The ſecond of thoſe who ſaid, *that our Works have no merit of themſelves, but as informed by Divine Grace, and from the Aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt, ſo they do truly merit Eternal Life.* And of this Opinion, he ſaith, was *Thomas de Argentina.* The third was, of thoſe who granted *that true Merit doth imply an Equality, but then they diſtinguiſh Equality, as to Quantity, and as to Proportion, and as to this latter Senſe, they aſſerted an Equality.* And of this Opinion, he ſaith, was *Petrus de Tarantaſia.* But he delivers his own Judgment in theſe Concluſions. Marſil. *in l.* 2. *Sent. q.* 18.

1. *That our Works are either conſider'd in themſelves, or with Divine Grace; are not meritorious of Eternal Life* ex condigno, which he proves both from Scripture and Reaſon, *viz.* Becauſe, 1. *No Man can make God a Debtor to him; for the more Grace he hath, the more he is a Debtor to God. And* 2. *He cannot merit of another by what he receives from him. And* 3. *No Man can pay what he owes to God, and therefore can never merit at his Hands.* 4. *No Man can merit here ſo much Grace as to keep him from falling away from Grace; much leſs then Eternal Life.*

2. *Theſe*

2. *These Works may be said to be meritorious of Eternal Life* ex condigno *by Divine Acceptation originally proceeding from the Merit of Christ's Passion, because that makes them worthy.* But this is *Christ's Merit*, and not the *true Merit* of our Works.

3. *Works done by Grace do merit Eternal Life* de congruo, *from* God's *liberal Disposition, whereby he hath appointed so to reward them. It being agreeable to him to give Glory to them that love him.* But this is an improper kind of Merit, and can by no means support the Tradition of true Merit.

Durand. *in sent. l.* 2. *dist.* 27. *q.* 2. *n.* 14.

*Durandus* utterly denies any *true Merit* of Man towards God; he doth not deny it in a *large improper Sense* for such a *Condignity* in our Actions as God hath appointed in order to a Reward; which is by the Grace of God in us; but as it is taken for a *free Action, to which a Reward is in Justice due; because whatever we do is more owing to the Grace of* God *than to our selves; but to make a Debtor to us, we must not only pay an Equivalent to what we owe, but we must go beyond it; but to God and our Parents we can never pay an Equivalent, much less exceed it. And we can never merit by what God gives us, because the Gift lays a greater Obligation upon us.* And he saith, *the holding the contrary is temerarious and blasphemous.*

The two Grounds of holding Merit were, the *supposing a Proportion between Grace and Glory, and an Equality between Divine Grace and Glory in Virtue, Grace being as the Seed of Glory*; and to both these he answers.

To the first, *That the giving a Reward upon Merit is no part of distributive, but commutative Justice, because it respects the Relation of one thing to another, and not the mere Quality of the Person.*

To the second, *That the Value of an Act is not considered with Respect to the first Mover, but to the immediate Agent: And as to Grace being the Seed of Glory, it is but a metaphorical Expression, and nothing can be drawn from it.* So that *Durandus* concludes *true Merit*, with respect to God, to be *temerarious, blasphemous and impossible.*

Ockam *in* 4. *sent. q.* 3. *ad secundum. in l.* 1. *dist.* 17. *q.* 1. *in l.* 1. *dist.* 17. *q.* 2.

*Ockam* declares, *That after all our good Works*, God *may, without Injustice, deny Eternal Life to them who do them; because*, God *can be Debtor to none, and therefore whatever he doth to us, it is out of mere Grace. And that there can be nothing meritorious in any Act of ours, but from the Grace of* God *freely accepting it.* And therefore he must deny any *true Merit.*

Greg. Arim. *in l.* 1. *sent. dist.* 17. *art.* 2.

*Gregorious Ariminensis* saith, *That no Act of ours, tho' coming from Grace to never so great a degree, is meritorious with* God ex condigno *of any Reward either Temporal or Eternal; because every such Act is a Gift of* God; *and if it were at all meritorious, yet not as to Eternal Life, because there is no Equivalency between them, and therefore it cannot in Justice be due to it; and consequently if* God *gives it, he must do it freely. But*, saith he, God *is said to be just when he gives* bona pro bonis, *and merciful when he gives* bona pro malis; *not but that he is merciful in both, but because his Mercy appears more in the latter, and in the other, it seems like Justice in a general Sense from the Conformity of the Merit and the Reward; but in this particular Retribution it is mere Mercy.*

Scot. *in. l.* 1. *sent. dist.* 17. *q.* 3. *n.* 24.

*Scotus* affirms, *That all the Meritoriousness of our Acts depends on Divine Acceptation in order to a Reward; and if it depend on the intrinsick Worth of the Acts*, God *could not in Justice deny the Reward; which is false, and therefore it wholly depends on the good Will and Favour of* God.

Bell. *de Just. l.* 5. *c.* 17.

*Bellarmin* is aware of this, and he confesses this to be the Opinion of *Scotus*, and of other old Schoolmen. But how then do they hold the

Doctrine

Doctrine and Tradition of *true Merit?* He holds, *that good Works are properly and truly good.* So do we, and yet deny *Merit.* But he grants, *that he denies that they bear any proportion to Eternal Life*; and therefore they cannot be truly meritorious of it. *Bellarmine* himself asserts, *that without the Divine Promise, good Works have a proportion to Eternal Life*; and this he saw necessary to defend the Doctrine of the Council of *Trent*: but then he adds, *That there is no Obligation on God's Part, to reward in such a manner without a Promise.* Now here are two hard Points, 1. To make it appear that there is such a Meritoriousness in good Works *without a Divine Promise.* 2. That if there were so, there is no Obligation on God to reward such Acts in point of Justice. The former is so much harder to do from what he had proved before, *c.* 14. viz. *that they are not meritorious without a Promise*; and here he proves, *that they have no proportion to the Reward, from Scripture, Fathers and Reason*; *because there is no Obligation on God to do it, either from commutative or distributive Justice, and because we are God's Servants.* These are good Arguments against himself; for how can such Acts then become Meritorious without a Promise? If there be no Proportion or Equality on Man's Part, no Justice on God's part to reward, how can they possibly be Meritorious? But this is too deep for me to comprehend. My Business is *Tradition*, and I have evidently prov'd that there was no *Tradition*, even in the Church of *Rome*, for the *true Merit* defined by the *Council* of *Trent*. It were easie to carry this Point higher, by shewing that the Fathers knew nothing of this Doctrine, but that hath been done by many already, and it is needless in so plain a Case.

But I am now to give an Account by what *Steps* and *Occasions* this Doctrine came to be establish'd.

1. From the common Use of the Word *Merit* with the Fathers and others, in another Sense than it signified at first. The original Signification of it is, *Wages* paid in consideration of *Service*; and from thence *Soldiers were said* merere (as *Budæus* observes, and thence came the word *mercès*) who truly deserved their Pay by their Labour and Hazard; but by degrees it came no signifie to more than *merely to attain a thing*; which is sometimes used by good Authors; but in the Declension of the Latin Tongue, no Sense of this word was more common than this, especially among *Ecclesiastical Writers.* Who frequently used it in a Sense wherein it was impossible to understand it in its original Signification; and it cannot imply so much as *dignè consequi*, as in the Instance brought by *Cassander*; when S. *Cyprian* renders those Words of S. *Paul*, *Misericordiam merui*, which we render, *I obtain'd Mercy*; but the Council of *Trent* allows, there could be no *true Merit* here. And S. *Augustin* saith of those who murder'd the Son of God, *Illi veniam meruerunt qui Christum occiderunt.* And so the vulgar Latin often uses it, *Gen.* 4. 13. *major est iniquitas mea quàm ut veniam merear.* Jos. 11. 20. *& non mererentur ullam Clementiam.* And in that Sense it hath been used in the *Hymns* and other *Offices* of the *Church*, as in that Expression, *O felix culpa quæ talem ac tantum meruit habere Redemptorem!* Where it cannot be deny'd that the word is used in an improper Sense.

Jos. Scalig. *in* Varr. *de L. L. p.* 172. Bud. *in Pandect. p.* 362. Plin. *Ep. l.* 1. 8.

Cassand. *in Hymn. Eccl. p.* 179.

Aug. *in* Joh. *Tr.* 31. *n.* 9.

2. When the School Divines set themselves to explain the Mysteries of *Theology*, this plain and easie, but improper Sense of *Merit*, would not go down with some of them; but they endeavour'd to make out the Notion of Merit, with respect to God, in its *proper and original Sense.* The last considerable Writer, before the *Scholastick Age*, was,

S. *Bernard*, and he pretended not to find out any ſuch Proportion between the beſt Works and Eternal Life, *that God ſhould be bound in Juſtice to beſtow it as a Recompence for them*; and the Reaſon he gives is plain and ſtrong, *becauſe thoſe things Men pretend to merit by, are themſelves the Gifts of God's Grace, and ſo by them they are more bound to God than God to them*; but beſides, *What are all Mens Merits to Eternal Glory?* S. *Bernard* doth not ſpeak of *Merits without Grace*, but with the *Suppoſition* of it; and *Bellarmine* wiſely left out the latter Part, that he might ſeem to anſwer the former.

*Neque enim talia ſunt hominum merita, ut propter ea vita æterna deberetur ex jure, aut Deus injuriam aliquam faceret, niſi eam donaret. Nam ut taceam quod merita omnia Dona Dei ſunt, & ita homo magis propter ipſa Deo debitor eſt, quàm Deus homini, quid ſunt merita omnia ad tantam gloriam?* Bernard. *Serm.* 1. *de Annun.* Bellarm. *de Juſtif. l.* 5. *c.* 6.

Hugo de S. Vict. *Annot. Elucidator. in* Rom.

*Hugo de Sancto Victore* lived in the ſame Age, who firſt ſhewed the way to *School Divinity*, and upon the ſame place which S. *Bernard* ſpeaks of, *Non ſunt condignæ, &c.* he puts the Queſtion, *How any Temporal Acts can merit that which is Eternal?* And he denies any *Condignity*, becauſe, *there is more in the Reward than there was in the Merit*; but then he adds, *that there may be a threefold Compariſon of things*; *either as to themſelves, as a Horſe for a Horſe, Mony for Mony*; *or according to Equity, either in Puniſhments or Rewards*; *or by Pact or Agreement, as when a good Sum is promiſed for a little Work*; *and this*, ſaith he, *God hath made known to Mankind, as to future Rewards and Puniſhments.* Which plainly ſhews, he underſtood nothing of the Proportion between Acts of Grace and an Eternal Happineſs, but reſolved all into the Favour and Mercy of God.

Lomb. *Sent. l.* 2. *diſt.* 27.

*Peter Lombard*, call'd *the Maſter of the Sentences*, *ſaith nothing of any Condignity or Proportion in our Works to the Reward*; *but*, he ſaith, *they are themſelves God's Gifts, and that the Reward it ſelf is from the Grace of God*; and quotes the noted Saying of S. *Auguſtin*, *Cùm coronat Deus merita noſtra, nihil aliud coronat quàm dona ſua.* But ſtill this is nothing but Grace and Favour in God, firſt in enabling us to do good Works, and then in rewarding them.

Genebrard. *de Trinit. l.* 3. *p.* 312.

*Baudinus* wrote a Book of the *Sentences* much about the time *P. Lombard* did, with ſo much Agreement of Method and Expreſſions, that it is not known which took from the other. *Genebrard* hath produced this Paſſage out of him, *Debet, inciviliter de Deo dicitur quia nihil omnino nobis debet, niſi ex promiſſo.* If it be ſo rude to ſay, *God owes any thing to his Creatures but by Promiſe*, he could not imagine any *Condignity* in good Works, to which a Reward is due in Juſtice. And *Genebrard* thinks he had reaſon to deny, *that God can be made a Debtor to us by any of our Works.*

Pull. *Sentent. Part.* 1. *c.* 13.

*Robertus Pullus*, who wrote another Book of the *Sentences* about the ſame time, mentioning that place, *Non ſunt condignæ, &c.* he ſaith, *becauſe our Works are not ſufficient, being ſmall and temporal, God by his Mercy makes it up*; which not only ſhews, that God doth reward beyond our Merit, but that there is no Proportion between the beſt Works and Eternal Glory.

Guliel. Antiſ. *l.* 3. *tr.* 12. *q.* 2. *de merito virt.*

But by the time of *Gulielmus Antiſſiodorenſis*, there were two Parties in the Church about this Point; *ſome*, he ſaith, *denied any Merit of Eternal Life, ex condigno*, and others aſſerted it; and after laying down the Arguments on both ſides, he concludes for the Affirmative; but in Anſwer to the Place, *Non ſunt condignæ, &c.* he ſaith they are not *ad proportionaliter merendum*, but they are *ad ſimpliciter merendum*, ſo that ſtill he denied any *Proportion*, tho' he held *ſimple Merit.*

But

But *Thomas Aquinas* coming after him, denies *that there can be any simple Merit with respect to God, because that cannot be where there is so great Inequality; and so there can be no equal Justice between them, but according to a Proportion*; which he afterwards explains, viz. *as to the Substance and Freedom of our good Works, there is only a Congruity; but as they proceed from Divine Grace, so they are meritorious of Eternal Life*, ex condigno. 1. 2. q. 114. art. 1. Art. 3.

This Doctrine had some Followers in the Schools, but not many in comparison of those who opposed it, as appears by what is said already.

*Richardus de Mediavilla*, tho' a *Franciscan*, follows herein the Doctrine of *Aquinas*, and asserts, *That by Acts of Free Will, informed by Grace, a Man may merit Eternal Life*, ex condigno; and he adds somewhat more, *potest certissimè*; and he uses the same Answers to the Objections which the other did. Richard. *in Sent. l.* 2. *dist.* 27. *art.* 2. Q. 3.

And *Nic. de Orbillis* follows *Richardus*, so that *Aquinas* his Doctrine had prevailed beyond his own School. Nich. d'Orb. *in Sent. l.* 2. *dist.* 27.

But it was as vehemently opposed by others of that Fraternity, among whom Cardinal *Hosius* mentions *Stephanus Brulifer*, who maintained, *that no Act of Grace, how good soever, was worthy of Eternal Life.* Hos. *Confess.* Petrico. *c.* 73. *p.* 141.

*Paulus Burgensis*, tho' he is said to have been converted from being a *Jew*, by reading *Aquinas*, yet utterly dissented from him in this matter: For, saith he, *that no Man can, by the ordinary Assistance of Grace, merit Eternal Life* ex condigno, *and therefore the Mercy of God is most seen in Heaven.* P. Burg. *addit. ad* Lyram *in* Ps. 35.

However, the Reputation of *Aquinas* might gain upon some, yet this was very far from being a *Catholick Tradition.*

But no Council ever interposed its Authority in this matter, till the Council of *Trent*, which resolved to carry the Points in difference to the Height, and to establish every thing that was question'd. Nothing had been more easie than to have given Satisfaction in this matter, considering what *Pighius* and *Contarenus*, and even *Genebrard*, had yielded in it; but there the Rule was, that every thing that was disputed, must be determin'd first, and then defended.

And so it happened with this Decree, which lest we should think the Matter capable of softening, hath been since asserted in the highest manner. *Bellarmine* asserts *good Works of themselves, and not merely by compact, to be meritorious of Eternal Life, so that in them there is a certain Proportion and Equality to Eternal Life.* Bell. *de justif. l.* 5. *c.* 17.

*Costerus* saith, *That in Works of Grace, there is an Equality between the Work and the Reward.* Coster. *Enchirid. p.* 294.

*Suarez, That they have an intrinsical Dignity, whereby they become worthy of Eternal Life.* Suarez. *de Grat. l.* 12. *c.* 1. *n.* 18.

*Vasquez, That there is an Equality of Dignity between Good Works and Eternal Life, without which a Promise could not make true Merit.* Vasquez *in* 1, 2. *Disp.* 213. *c.* 5.

The *Remists* say, *That good Works are truly and properly meritorious, and justly worthy of Everlasting Life; and that thereupon, Heaven is the just Due, and just Stipend, Crown or Recompence, which God by his Justice oweth to the Persons so dong by his Grace.* Rhemists *on* 2 Tim. 4. 8.

And again, *That good Works are meritorious, and the very Cause of Salvation, so far that God should be unjust, if he rendred not Heaven for the same.* On Heb. 6. 8.

Gamech. *in* 1. 2. *Th. Qu.* 114. *c.* 2. *Concil.* 2. *Omnes Catholici fatentur juſtos ſuis bonis operibus mereri gloriam de Condigno.*

*Phil. Gamachæus*, a late Profeſſor of Divinity in the *Sorbon*, ſpeaks it roundly, That the *Council* of *Trent* did plainly mean to eſtabliſh Merit *ex Condigno*, and that all Catholicks are agreed in it.

Aug. Reding *Defenſ. Conc.* Trident. *Tr.* 4. *Sect.* 2. *ad Seſſ.* 6. *c.* 1.

The laſt Defender of the Council of *Trent* within theſe few Years, ſaith, *That there is an intrinſical Condignity in good Works, whereby they bear a Proportion commenſurate with the Glory of Heaven. And without ſuch Doctrine as this, he doth not think the* Council *of* Trent *can be defended in this matter.*

If after all it be ſaid, That this is a mere Subtility concerning the Proportion an Act of Grace bears to the State of Glory. I anſwer, The more to blame they, who have made and impoſed it as a matter of Faith, as the Council of *Trent* hath done with an *Anathema*, and that without any Pretence from *Catholick Tradition.*

But what made the Council of *Trent* ſo much concerned for a Scholaſtick Subtility? There was a deep Myſtery lay in this, They were wiſe enough to frame the Decree ſo, as to avoid Offence, and to make it appear plauſible, but, it was enough to the People to underſtand that the Merit of *good Works* was allow'd, and they were to believe the Prieſts, both as to the *good Works* they were to do, and as to the putting them into a *State of Grace*, to make them capable of *meriting.* And this was the true Reaſon of the *Anathema*, againſt thoſe who ſhould deny the *true Merit of good Works.*

## V. Of the Number of Sacraments.

*Seſſ.* 7. *Can.* 1.

The *Council* of *Trent* pronounces an *Anathema* in theſe words, *If any one ſaith that Sacraments of the new Law were not all appointed by Jeſus Chriſt our Lord, or that they were more or fewer than Seven*, viz. *Baptiſm, Confirmation, Euchariſt, Penance, extreme Unction, Orders and Matrimony, or that any one of theſe is not truly and properly a Sacrament, let him be* Anathema.

But what is it to be *truly and properly a Sacrament?*

It had been very reaſonable to have defined a *Sacrament*, firſt, *truly and properly*, before ſuch an *Anathema* paſſed. But that Defect may be ſaid to be ſupplied by the *Roman Catechiſm*, Publiſh'd by Authority of the Council; and there we are told, That a *Sacrament* is a ſenſible thing, which by Divine Inſtitution hath a Power of cauſing, as well as ſignifying Holineſs and Righteouſneſs. So that to a true and proper Sacrament two things are neceſſary,

*Catech.* Trident. *Part.* 2. *n.* 10.

1. That it be of *Divine Inſtitution.*
2. That it *confer Grace on thoſe who partake of it.*

And by theſe we muſt examine the *Catholick Tradition* about the Number of *Sacraments.*

Bell. *de Sacram. l.* 2. *c.* 25.

*Bellarmine* ſaith, *That all their Divines, and the whole Church for* 500 *Years*, viz. *from the time of the Maſter of the Sentences, have agreed in the Number of the ſeven Sacraments.*

Here we ſee is a bold Appeal to *Tradition* for 500 Years; but altho', if it were proved, it cannot be ſufficient to prove an *Apoſtolical Tradition*; for the Fathers might for 1000 Years have held the contrary; and I do not think one clear Teſtimony can be produced out of Antiquity for that Number of Sacraments, truly ſo called; yet I ſhall at preſent wholly wave the Debate of the former times, and confine my ſelf

ſelf to *Bellarmine*'s 500 Years; and I hope to make it appear, there was no *Univerſal Tradition* for it within his own time.

For *Alexander Hales* (who wrote, ſaith *Poſſevin*, his *Sum* of *Divinity*, *by Order of* Innocent IV, *and it was approv'd by* Alexander IV, with *Seventy Divines*) *affirms*, *There were but Four proper Sacraments*; now if this were the *Catholick Tradition* then, *That there were Seven proper Sacraments*, how could this Doctrine paſs, and be ſo highly approved? He ſaith farther, *That Chriſt himſelf only appointed two*, viz. *Baptiſm and the Lord's Supper*; *and for the reſt*, he ſaith, *it may be preſum'd the Apoſtles did appoint them by Chriſt's Direction, or by Divine Inſpiration.* But how can that be, when he ſaith, The *Form* even of thoſe he calls *proper Sacraments*, was either appointed by our Lord or by the Church? How can ſuch Sacraments be of *Divine Inſtitution*, whoſe very Form is appointed by the Church? He puts the Queſtion himſelf, *Why Chriſt appointed the Form only of Two Sacraments, when all the Grace of the Sacraments comes from him*? He anſwers, *becauſe theſe are the principal Sacraments which unite the whole Man in the Body of the Church, by Faith and Charity.* But yet this doth not clear the Difficulty, how thoſe can be *proper* Sacraments, whoſe Form is not of Divine Inſtitution; as he grants in the Sacrament of *Penance* and *Orders*, the Form is of the *Church's Appointment.*

*In quatuor quæ ſunt propriè dicta Sacramenta novæ legis eſt forma inſtituta à Domino vel ab Eccleſia.* Alex. Halenſ. *Part.* 4. *q.* 5. M. 3. *a.* 2. *Memb.* 2. *a.* 1. *Memb.* 3. *a.* 2. *Sect.* 3.

And this will not only reach to this great *School Divine*, but to as many others as hold it in the Church's Power to appoint or alter the *Matter* and *Form* of ſome of thoſe they call *Sacraments.* For, however they may uſe the Name, they can never agree with the Council of *Trent*, in the Nature of the *Seven Sacraments*, which ſuppoſes them to be of *Divine Inſtitution*, as to *Matter* and *Form.* And ſo the Divines of the Church of *Rome* have agreed ſince the Council of *Trent.*

*Bellarmine* hath a Chapter on purpoſe to ſhew, That the Matter and Form of *Sacraments* are ſo certain and determinate, that nothing can be changed in them; and this Determination muſt be by God himſelf. *Which*, he ſaith, *is moſt certain among them*; and he proves it by a ſubſtantial Reaſon, *viz. Becauſe the Sacraments are the Cauſes of Grace, and no one can give Grace but* God, *and therefore none elſe can appoint the Eſſentials of* Sacraments *but He*, and therefore he calls it *Sacrilege to change even the Matter of* Sacraments.

Bell. *de Sacr. l.* 1. *c.* 21.

*Suarez* aſſerts, *That both the Matter and Form of* Sacraments *are determin'd by Chriſt's Inſtitution*; *and as they are determined by him, they are neceſſary to the making of* Sacraments. *And this*, he ſaith, abſolutely ſpeaking, *is* de Fide, *or an Article of Faith.* And he proves it from the Manner of Chriſt's Inſtituting Baptiſm and the Euchariſt; and he urges the ſame Reaſon, *becauſe Chriſt only can confer Grace by the Sacraments, and therefore he muſt appoint the Matter and Form of them.*

Suarez. *in* 3. *p. Th. To.* 3. *Diſp.* 2. *Sect.* 3.

Cardinal *Lugo* affirms, *That Chriſt hath appointed both Matter and Form of the Sacraments*; which he proves from the Council of *Trent.* He thinks *Chriſt* might have granted a Commiſſion to his Church to appoint Sacraments, which he would make efficacious, but he neither believes that he hath done it, or that it was fitting to be done.

Lugo *de Sacram. Diſp.* 2. *Sect.* 5.

*Petrus à Sancto Joſeph*; ſaith, *That altho' the* Council *of* Trent *doth not expreſly affirm the* Sacraments *to be immediately inſtituted by Chriſt, yet it is to be ſo underſtood. And altho' the Church may appoint* Sacraments, *i. e.* Rites about the Sacraments, *yet Chriſt himſelf muſt appoint the* Sacraments *themſelves*; and he concludes, *That no Creature can have Autho-*

Petr. à Sanct. Joſeph. *Idea Theol. Sacr. l.* 1. *c.* 3.

*rity*

*rity to make Sacraments conferring Grace*; and therefore he declares *that Christ did appoint the Forms of all the Sacraments himself, although we do not read them in Scripture.*

If now it appears that some, even of the Church of *Rome* before the Council of *Trent*, did think it in the *Church's Power* to appoint or alter the *Matter* and *Form* of some of those they called *Sacraments*, then it will evidently follow they had not the same Tradition about the Seven Sacraments which is there deliver'd.

## Of Chrism.

Conc. Trid. *De confirm. can.* 2. Conc. Florent. *Decret. Unionis.* Marsil. *in seno. l.* 4. *q.* 5. *a.* 1.

The Council of *Trent* declares the matter to be of *Confirmation* to be *Chrism*, viz. *a composition made of Oil of Olive and Balsam*; *the one to signifie the clearness of Conscience, the other the Odour of a good Fame*, saith the *Council* of *Florence*. But where was this *Chrism* appointed by Christ? *Marsilius* saith from *Petrus Aureolus*, *that there was a Controversie between the Divines and Canonists about this matter*; *and the latter affirmed that Chrism was not appointed by Christ, but afterwards by the Church*; *and that the Pope could dispense with it*; *which he could not do if it were of Christ's Institution.*

Aureol. *in* 4. *d.* 7. *q.* 1.

*Petrus Aureolus* was himself a great Man in the Church of *Rome*; and after he had mentioned this difference, and named one *Brocardus* (or *Bernardus*) with other *Canonists* for it; he doth not affirm the contrary to be a *Catholick Tradition*; but himself asserts the *Chrism* not to be necessary to the *Sacrament* of *Confirmation*; which he must have done if he had believed it of divine institution.

Greg. de Val. *To.* 4. *Q.* 5. *Punct.* 2.

*Gregory de Valentia* on the occasion of this opinion of the *Canonists*, *that Confirmation might be without Chrism*, saith two notable things. 1. *That they were guilty of Heresie therein:* for which he quotes *Dominicus Soto.* 2. *That he thinks there were no Canonists left of that mind.* If not, the Change was the greater; since it is certain they were of that opinion before. For *Guido Brianson* attests, *that there was a difference between the Divines and Canonists about this matter*; for *Bernard* the *Glosser* and others held, that *Chrism was not necessary to it, because it was neither appointed by Christ nor his Apostles, but in some ancient Councils.*

Guido Brianson *in* 4. *sent. q.* 5. *Conc.* 1.

Gul. Antis. *in l.* 4. *tract.* 9.

*Guil. Antissiodorensis* long before mentions the opinion of those who said *that Chrism was appointed by the Church after the Apostles times*; *and that they confirmed only by imposition of hands*; but he doth not condemn it; only *he thinks it better to hold that the Apostles used Chrism, although we never read that they did it.* But he doth not lay that opinion only on the *Canonists*; for there were *Divines* of great note of the same. For,

Bonav. *in* 4. *d.* 7. *a.* 1. *q.* 2. Alex. *p.* 4. *q.* 9. *memb.* 1.

*Bonaventure* saith, *that the Apostles made use neither of their Matter nor Form in their Confirmation*; *and his Resolution is, that they were appointed by the Governours of the Church afterwards*; as his Master *Alexander* of *Hale* had said before him, who attributes the *Institution* of both to a Council of *Meaux.*

Jac. de Vitr. *Hist. Occid. c.* 37.

Cardinal *de Vitriaco* saith, *that Confirmation by Imposition of Hands was from the Apostles*; *but by Chrism from the Church*; *for we do not read that the Apostles used it.*

Aq. *p.* 3. *q.* 72. *a.* 1. *Resp. ad* 1.

*Thomas Aquinas* confesses *there were different Opinions about the institution of this Sacrament*; *some held that it was not instituted by Christ nor his Apostles, but afterwards in a certain Council.* But he never blames these for contradicting *Catholick Tradition*, although he dislikes their Opinion.

*Cajetan*

*Cajetan* on *Aquinas* ſaith, *that Chriſm with Balſam was appointed by the Church after the Primitive times*; and yet now, this muſt be believed to be eſſential to this Sacrament; and by *Conink* it ſeems *to be heretical to deny it.* For he affirms, *that it ſeems to be an Article of Faith that Confirmation muſt be with Chriſm*; *and no Catholick*, he ſaith, *now denies it.* Which ſhews, that he believed the ſenſe of the Church not to have been always the ſame about it. Conink. *de Sacram q.* 72. *a.* 3. *dub.* 1.

But others ſpeak out, as *Gregory de Valentia*, *Suarez*, *Filliucius* and *Tanner*, who ſay abſolutely, *it is now a matter of Faith to hold Chriſm to be eſſential to Confirmation*; *and that it is now not only erroneous but heretical to deny it.* Their Teſtimonies are at large produced by *Petrus Aurelius*, or the famous *Abbat* of S. *Cyran.* And even he grants it to be *Hereſie* ſince the Council of *Trent*; but he yields that *Alenſis*, *Bonaventure* and *de Vitriaco* all held that Opinion, which was made Hereſie by it. From whence it follows, that there hath been a Change in the Doctrine of the *Roman* Church about Confirmation by *Chriſm.* For if it be Hereſie now to aſſert that which was deny'd without any Reproach before, the Tradition cannot be ſaid to continue the ſame. Petr. Aurel. *Opr. p.* 546, 547. *p.* 567.

Thus we have ſeen there was no certain Tradition for the Matter of this Sacrament, and as little is there for the Form of it. Which is, *Conſigno te ſigno Crucis*, *& confirmo te Chriſmate ſalutis in nomine Patris*, *&c.* But *Sirmondus* produces another Form out of S. *Ambroſe*, *Deus Pater omnipotens*, *qui te regeneravit ex Aqua & Spiritu Sancto*, *conceſſitque tibi peccata tua*, *ipſe te ungat in vitam æternam.* And from thence concludes the preſent Form not to be ancient; and he confeſſes, that both *Matter* and *Form* of this Sacrament are changed. Which was an ingenuous Confeſſion; but his Adverſary takes this Advantage from it; That then the *Sacrament* it ſelf muſt be changed, if both Matter and Form were; and then the Church muſt be a very unfaithful Keeper of Tradition, which I think is unanſwerable. *Suarez* propoſes the Objection fairly, both as to the Matter and Form of this Sacrament, that we read nothing of them in Scripture, and Tradition is very various about them; but his Anſwer is very inſufficient, *viz.* That tho' it be not in Scripture, yet they have them by Tradition from the Apoſtles; now that is the very thing which *Sirmondus* diſproves, and ſhews that the Church of *Rome* is clearly gone off from *Tradition* here, both as to *Matter* and *Form*. Sirmon. Ant. 2. *p.* 64. *p.* 63. Petr. Aurel. *Op. p.* 567. Suarez. *To.* 3. *q.* 3. *p. Th.* & 72. *Diſp.* 33. *Sect.* 5.

## Of Orders.

I proceed to the *Sacrament* of *Orders*. It is impoſſible for thoſe of the Church of *Rome* to prove this a *true and proper Sacrament*, on their own Grounds. For, they aſſert, that ſuch a one muſt have Matter and Form appointed by Chriſt; but that which they account the *Matter* and *Form* of *Orders*, were neither of them of Chriſt's Inſtitution. The Council of *Florence*, they ſay, hath declared both; the matter is that, *by the Delivery whereof the Order is confer'd*, *as that of Prieſthood*, *by the Delivery of the Chalice with the Wine*, *and the Paten with the Bread*; *and the Form* is, *Accipe poteſtatem offerendi Sacrificium in Eccleſia pro vivis & mortuis.* Now if neither of theſe be owned by themſelves to have been appointed by Chriſt, then it neceſſarily follows, that they cannot hold this to be a *true and proper Sacrament.* Impoſition of Hands, they grant, was uſed by the Apoſtles, and ſtill continu'd in the Chriſtian Church; and *Bellarmine* confeſſes, That nothing elſe can be proved by Decret. *Unionis.* Bell. *de Sacr. Ordinis*, *l.* 1. *c.* 9.

*be proved by Scripture to be the external Symbol in this Sacrament.* And others are forced to say, That Christ hath not determin'd the Matter and Form of this Sacrament particularly, but hath left a Latitude in it for the Church to determine it. Which in my opinion, is clear giving up the Cause, as to this Sacrament.

Arcud. *de Sacram. l. 6. c. 4.*

It is observed by *Arcudius*, That the Council of *Trent* doth not declare the particular Matter and Form of this Sacrament, but only in general, that is performed by Words and external Signs, *Sess. 23. c. 3.* From whence he infers, *that the outward Sign was left to the Church's Determination*; and he saith, *That Christ did particularly appoint the Matter and Form of some Sacraments, as of* Baptism *and the* Lord's Supper, *and* Extreme Unction, *but not of others*; *and therefore, in the* Sacrament of Orders, he saith, *Christ determin'd no more but that it should be convey'd by some visible Sign*; *and so it may be either by the Delivering the Vessels, or by the Imposition of Hands, or both.* But we are to consider, that the Council of *Florence* was received by the Council of *Trent*; and that 'tis impossible to reconcile this Doctrine with the general Definition of a Sacrament by the *Roman Catechism, viz.* That it is a sensible thing which by the Institution of Christ hath a Power of causing, as well as signifying Grace; which implies, that the external Sign which conveys Grace, must be appointed by the Author of the Sacrament it self, or else the Church must have Power to annex Divine Grace to its own Appointments. But, here lies the main Difficulty, the Church of *Rome* hath alter'd both *Matter* and *Form* of this Sacrament from the Primitive Institution; and yet it dares not disallow the Ordinations made without them, as is notorious in case of the *Greek* Church; and therefore they have been forc'd to allow this Latitude, as to the *Matter* and *Form* of this Sacrament; altho' such an Allowance doth really overthrow its being a true and proper Sacrament on their own Grounds.

Lug. *de Sac. Disp. 2. Sect. 5. n. 85. n. 92.*

Yet this Doctrine hath very much prevail'd of late among their chief Writers. Cardinal *Lugo* confesses, *That of old, Priesthood was confer'd by* Imposition of Hands, *with suitable words*; *and he saw it himself so done at* Rome, *without delivering the Vessels by Chatholick Greek Bishops*, He saith farther, *That the Fathers and Councils are so plain, for the conferring Priesthood by* Imposition of Hands, *that no one can deny it*; but yet he must justifie the *Roman* Church in assuming new *Matter* and *Form*; which he doth, by asserting, That Christ left the Church at liberty, as to them.

Ysambert. *de Sacram. Ordinis, Disp. 3. Art. 6.*

*Nichol. Ysambertus* debates the Point at large, and his Resolution of it is, *That Christ determin'd onely the general Matter, but the particular Sign was left to the Church; and he proves by Induction, that the Church hath appointed the External Sign in this Sacrament; and as to the Order of Priesthood,* he proves, *that* Imposition of Hands *was of old an essential part of it, but now it is onely accidental.*

Hallier *de Sacrâ Elect. & Ordinat. Sect. 2. c. 2. Art. 1.*

*Franciscus Hallier* confesses the Matter of this *Sacrament* to have been different, in different times. In the Apostles Times, and many Ages after, hardly any other can be found but *Imposition of Hands*, as he proves from Scripture and Fathers. He carries his Proofs down as low as the *Synod* of *Aken*, in the time of *Ludovicus Pius*, and the Council of *Meaux*, *Anno Dom.* 845. but afterwards he saith, *That by the Council of* Florence, *and the common Opinions of their Divines, the Delivery of the Vessels is the essential Matter of this* Sacrament. Here we find a plain Change in the Matter of a Sacrament owned after the Continuance of

*P.* 439.

above

above 800 Years; and yet we must believe the Tradition of this Church to have been always the same. Which is impossible, by the Confession of their own Writers. He cannot tell just the time when the Change was made, but he concludes, it was before the time of the *Vetus Ordo Romanus*, which mentions the Vessels.

*Petrus à Sancto Joseph* saith, *That by Christ's Institution, there is a Latitude allow'd in the matter of Orders*; but he shews not where; but he thinks, of it self it consists in the *Delivery of the Vessels*, but by the Pope's Permission, *Imposition of Hands* may be sufficient. Which is a Doctrine which hath neither Scripture, Reason nor Tradition for it. Petr. à Sanct. Joseph. *Idea Theol. Sacr. l. 4. c. 1. p. 396.*

*Joh. Morinus*, shews, that there are five Opinions in the Church of *Rome* about the Matter of this Sacrament. *The first, and most common, that it consists in the* Delivery of the Vessels. *The second, that* Imposition of Hands, *together with that, makes up the matter. The third, that they convey* two different Powers. *The fourth, that* Unction, *with* Imposition of Hands, *is the Matter. The fifth, that* Imposition of Hands *alone is it*; *and this*, saith he, *the whole Church*, Greek *and* Latin, *ever owned*; but he saith, *he can bring two Demonstrations against the first, i. e.* against the general Sense of the now Roman Church. 1. *From the Practice of the Greek Church, which never used it.* 2. *From the old Rituals of the Latin Church, which do not mention them*; and he names some above 800 Years old; and in none of them he finds either the *Matter* or *Form* of this *Sacrament*, as it is now practis'd in the Church of *Rome*; nor in *Isidore*, *Alcuinus*, *Amalarius*, *Rabanus Maurus*, *Valafridus Strabo*, altho' they wrote purposely about these things. He thinks *it was first received into the publick Offices in the tenth Age.* Afterwards he saith, *he wonders how it came about that any should place the essential Matter of* Ordination *only in* Delivery of the Vessels, *and exclude the* Imposition of Hands, *which alone is mention'd by Scripture and Fathers.* And again he saith, *it strikes him with Astonishment, that there should be such an Alteration, both as to* Matter *and* Form. And at last he saith, *Christ hath determin'd no particular* Matter *and* Form *in this* Sacrament. Morin. *de Sacris Ordin. Part. 3. Exercit. 7. c. 1. c. 3. n. 1. n. 6. c. 6. n. 2.*

But still the Difficulty returns, how this can be a true and proper *Sacrament*, whose *Matter* and *Form* depend on *Divine Institution*, when they confess there was no Divine Institution for the *Matter* and *Form* in *Orders?* Bell. *de Sacram. l. 2. c. 24.*

*Bellarmine* (as is proved before) hath a Chapter on purpose to prove that the Matter and Form of *Sacraments* are so determin'd, that it is not lawful to add, diminish or alter them; and he charges it on *Luther* as a part of his Heresie, *that no certain Form of Words was required to* Sacraments: and he makes it no less than Sacrilege to change the Matter of them. So that all such who hold the Matter and Form in *Orders* to be mutable, must either charge the Church of *Rome* with *Sacrilege*, or deny *Orders* to be a *true and proper Sacrament.*

## *Of the Sacrament of* Penance.

The next new *Sacrament* is that of *Penance*. They are agreed, that *Matter* and *Form* are both necessary to a *true and proper Sacrament*. The *Matter* is the external or sensible *Sign*; and what is that in this *New Sacrament?*

There are two things things necessary to the Matter of a *Sacrament*:

1. That it be an *external and sensible Sign*; which S. *Augustin* calls an

Aug. *in* Joh. *Tr.* 80. *Element* in that known Expreſſion, *Accedat verbum ad Elementum, & fit Sacramentum*; which *Bellarmine* would have underſtood only of *Baptiſm* there ſpoken of; but S. *Auguſtin*'s Meaning goes farther, as appears by his following Diſcourſe, and immediately he calls a Sacrament *verbum viſibile*; and therefore cannot be apply'd to words as they are heard, for ſo they have nothing of a Sacramental Sign in them. How then can *Contrition* make up any part of the Matter of a *Sacrament*, when it is not *external?* How can *Confeſſion*, when it is no *viſible Sign*, nor any permanent thing as an *Element* muſt be? How can *Satisfaction* be any part of the Sacrament, which may be done, when the Effect of the *Sacrament* is over in *Abſolution?*

S. Aug. *Ep. ad* Bonifac. 2. There muſt be a Reſemblance between the *Sign* and the *Thing ſignified*, which S. *Auguſtin* is ſo peremptory in, that he denies there can be any *Sacrament* where there is no *Reſemblance*. And from hence he ſaith, The *Signs* take the Name of the *Thing ſignified*; as after a certain manner, the *Sacrament* of the *Body of Chriſt is the Body of Chriſt*.

Suarez, *To.* 3. *in* 3. *C.* Q. 60. *Diſp.* 1. *n.* 3. *Sect.* 4. And this was looked on as ſo neceſſary, that *Hugo de Sancto Victore*, and *Peter Lombard*, both put it into the Definition of a Sacrament, as *Suarez* confeſſes, *viz. That it is the Viſible Appearance of Inviſible Grace, which bears the Similitude, and is the Cauſe of it.* But this is left out of the Definition in the *Roman Catechiſm*, and *Suarez* thinks it not neceſſary, for the ſame Reaſon; becauſe it is very hard to underſtand the Similitude between words ſpoken in *Confeſſion*, and the *Grace* ſuppoſed to be given by *Abſolution*, any more than in the words of *Abrenunciation*, and the *Grace of Baptiſm*. How can the Act of the *Penitent* ſignifie the Grace conveyed in *Abſolution?* For there is no effect of the *Sacrament* till *Abſolution*, by their own *Confeſſion*; and therefore the Acts of the Penitent being antecedent to it, and of a different Nature from it, can have no ſuch Reſemblance with it, as to ſignifie or repreſent it.

*Concil.* Flor. *Decr. Union.* *Concil.* Trid. *Seſſ.* 14. *c.* 3. However, the Councils of *Florence* and *Trent* have declared, that the Acts of the Penitent, *viz. Contrition*, *Confeſſion*, and *Satisfaction*, are *as the matter* in the Sacrament, *Quaſi materia:* What is this *quaſi materia?* Why not, *are the Matter?* Is not *true Matter* neceſſary to a *true Sacrament?* If there be none *true* here, then this can be but *quaſi Sacramentum*, *as it were a Sacrament*, and not *truly and properly ſo.* But if it be true Matter, why is it not ſo declared? But common Senſe hindred them, and not the Difference between the Matter here and in other Sacraments. For in the Definition of *Sacraments* they were to regard the *Truth*, and not the *kind* of Matter. *They are not ſolid and permanent Matter*, ſaith *Bellarmine*; *not Matter externally apply'd*, ſaith *Soto*; *not any Subſtance, but human Acts*, ſaith *Vaſquez*; but none of theſe clear the Point. For ſtill, if it be true Matter of a *Sacrament*, why was it not ſo declar'd? Why ſuch a Term of Diminution added, as all Men muſt underſtand it, who compare it with the Expreſſions about the other Sacraments?

Bell. *de pœnit.* *l.* 1. *c.* 16. Soto *in* *l.* 4. *ſent. d.* 14. *q.* 1. Vaſq. *in* 3. *p.* Q. 84. *art.* 1. *c.* 9.

But they knew very well there was a conſiderable Party in the Church of *Rome*, who deny'd the *Acts* of the *Penitent* to be the *Matter* or *Parts* of this *Sacrament*. The Council of *Colen* (but little before, the Council of *Trent*) *excludes the Acts of the Penitent from any Share in this Sacrament:* which *Bellarmine* denies not, but blames *Gropperus*, the ſuppoſed Author of the *Enchiridon* But *Gropperus* was thought fit to be a Cardinal, as well as *Bellarmine*, and certainly knew the Tradition of the Church, if there had been any ſuch in this Matter. The Council

*Enchirid.* Colon. *f.* 180. Bell. *de pœnit.* *l.* 1. *c.* 16.

of

of *Florence*, it is plain, he thought not to be a ſufficient Declarer of it. No more did *Joh. Major*, who after it deny'd this *Sacrament* to conſiſt of *Matter* and *Form*, or that the Acts of the Penitent were the Parts of it. So did *Gabriel Biel*, who refutes the contrary Opinion, and ſaith, *Contrition can be no part, becauſe it is no ſenſible Sign; and Satisfaction may be done after it.* So that he cuts off two Parts in three of the Matter of this pretended Sacrament.

Major *in* 4. *ſent. diſt.* 14. *q.* 2. Biel *in* 4. *diſt.* 14. *q.* 2.

*Guido Brianſon*, who liv'd after the Council of *Florence*, ſuppoſes no certain Tradition in the Church about this Matter; but he ſets down both Opinions, with their Reaſons, and prefers that which excludes the Acts of the Penitent from being Parts of the Sacrament; although the *Florentine* Council had declared the contrary.

Brianſon *in* 4. *ſent.* Q. 8. *Concl.* 3.

*Durandus* rejects two Parts in three of thoſe declared by the two Councils, and for the ſame Reaſons mentioned by *Biel.*

Durand. *in l.* 4. *Diſt.* 16. *q.* 1.

*Ockham* abſolutely denies all three to be Parts of the Sacrament. And ſo did *Scotus* before him; whoſe words are remarkable. *De Pœnitentiæ Sacramento Dico, quod illa tria nullo modo ſunt partes ejus, viz. Theſe three are by no means any part of the Sacrament of Penance*; and yet the Council of *Trent* not only declares that they are ſo, but denounces an *Anathema* againſt him that denies them to be required, as the *Matter of the Sacrament of Penance.* And let any one by this judge, what *Catholick Tradition* it proceeded upon; when ſome of the greateſt Divines in the Church of *Rome* were of another Opinion.

Ockam. *in* 4. *ſent. q.* 8. Scot. *in l.* 4. *ſent. diſt* 16. Q. 1. *Concil.* Trid. *Seſſ.* 14. *de Pœnit. Sacr. Can.* 4.

As to the Form of this Sacrament, the Council of *Trent* denounces an *Anathema* againſt thoſe who affirm *Abſolution* to be only declarative of the *Remiſſion of Sins:* and yet I ſhall prove, that this was the more current Doctrine, even in the Church of *Rome*, up to the Maſter of the *Sentences.*

*Can.* 9.

*Gabriel Biel*, ſaith, *The ancient Doctors did commonly follow it*; but it was oppoſed by *Scotus*, becauſe it ſeemed to take off from the Efficacy of *Abſolution*, and conſequently make it no *Sacrament*, which is a Cauſe of Grace. But after he hath ſet down *Scotus* his Argument, he ſaith, *That Opinion were very deſirable, if it had any Foundation in Scripture or Fathers.* And to his Arguments he anſwers, *That true Contrition obtains Pardon with God, before Sacerdotal Abſolution, but not with the Church; and that Contrition ſuppoſes a Deſire of Abſolution*; which will never hold to make Abſolution to confer the Grace of Remiſſion, if the Sin be really forgiven before. For what is the Deſire of the Penitent, to the Force of the Sacrament adminiſtred by the Prieſt? And he ſaith, they all grant, *that by true and ſufficient Contrition, the Sin is forgiven without the Sacrament in act, i. e.* the actual receiving Abſolution. So that there was an univerſal Tradition, as to the Power of Contrition, but in the other had different Opinions.

Biel. *in* 4. *Diſt.* 14. *q.* 2. *not.* 2.

*Marſilius* ſaith, *That God forgives Sin upon Contrition authoritatively; the Prieſt's Abſolution is miniſterial in the Court of Conſcience, and before the Church. And thoſe Sins which God firſt abſolves grom principally and authentically, the Priest afterwards abſolves from it in right of the Church, as its Miniſter.*

Marſil. *in* 4. *ſent. q.* 12. *Ar.* 2.

*Toſtatus* ſaith, *That the Prieſt's Abſolution follows God's.*

Toſtat. *Defenſ. part* 1. *c.* 6.

*Ockam, The Prieſts then bind and looſe, when they ſhew Men to be bound or looſed; and for this, he relies on the Maſter of the Sentences.*

Ockam. *in l.* 4. *q.* 9. *a.* 4. *ad* 1.

*Thomas de Argentina, That the Power of the Keys doth extend to the Remiſſion of the Fault which was done before by Contrition; but it tends to the Increaſe of Grace in the Perſon.*

Thom. *de* Argent. *l.* 4. *Diſt.* 18. *a.* 3.

Gul. Antiſ. *l.* 4. *f.* 254. *Gulielmus Antiſidore, That Contrition takes away the Guilt and Puniſhment of Sin, as to God and Conſcience, but not as to the Church, for a Man is ſtill bound to undergo the Penance which the Church enjoins him.*

Bonavent. *l.* 4. *diſt.* 18. *q.* 1. *Bonaventure, That the Abſolution preſuppoſes Grace; for no Prieſt would abſolve any one whom he did not preſume God had abſolved before.*

Alex. Halenſ. *part* 4. *q.* 21. *memb.* 3. *art.* 1. *Alexander Hales, That where God doth not begin in Abſolution, the Prieſt cannot make it up.*

Pet. Lomb. *l.* 4. *diſt.* 18. *part.* 1. But the *Maſter* of the *Sentences* himſelf, moſt fully handls this Point; and he ſhews from the Fathers, *That God alone can remit Sin, both as to the Fault and the Puniſhment due to it. And the Power of the Keys*, he ſaith, *is like the Prieſt's Judgment about Leproſie, in the Levitical Law, God healed the Perſon, and the Prieſt declared him healed. Or as our Saviour firſt raiſed* Lazarus, *then gave him to his Diſciples to be looſed. He is looſed before God, but not in the Face of the Church, but by the Prieſt's Judgment. Another way*, he ſaith, *Prieſts bind by enjoyning Penance, and they looſe by remitting it, or readmiting Perſons to Communion upon performing it.*

This Doctrine of *Peter Lombard*'s, is none of thoſe *in quibus Magiſter non tenetur*; for we ſee he had Followers of great Name, almoſt to the Council of *Trent*. But it happened, that both *Th. Aquinas* and *Scotus* agreed in oppoſing this Doctrine; and the *Franciſcans* and *Dominicans*, bearing greateſt Sway in the Debates of the *Council* of *Trent*, what they agreed in, paſſed for *Catholick Tradition*. And *Vaſquez* is in the right, when he ſaith, This Doctrine was condemn'd by the *Council of Trent*; and ſo was *Scotus*, when he ſaid, That it did derogate from the *Sacrament of Penance*; for in truth, it makes it but a *hominal Sacrament*, ſince it hath no Power of conferring Grace; which the Council of *Trent* makes neceſſary to a *true and proper Sacrament*.

Vaſquez. *in* 3. Q. 84. *A.* 3. *dub.* 2. 17.

The main Point in this Debate, is, whether *true Contrition* be required to *Abſolution*, or not? Which *Scotus* ſaw well enough, and argues accordingly. For none of them deny, that where there is true Contrition, there is immediately an Abſolution before God; and if this be required before the Prieſt's Abſolution, he can have no more to do, but to pronounce, or declare him abſolv'd. But if ſomething leſs than *Contrition* do qualifie a Man for *Abſolution*, and by that Grace be conveyed, then the Power of Abſolution hath a great and real Effect; for it puts a Man into a *State of Grace* which he had not been in without it. And from hence came the Opinion, that *Attrition*, with *Abſolution*, was ſufficient; and they do not underſtand the Council of *Trent*'s Doctrine of the Sacrament of Penance, who deny it, as will appear to any one that reads the 4th Chapter of the Sacrament of Penance, and compares it with the 7 and 8 Canons about *Sacraments in general*. It is true, that Contrition is there ſaid to have the firſt place in the Acts of the Penitent; but obſerve what follows: *True Contrition reconciles a Man to God, before he receives this Sacrament*. What hath the Prieſt then to do, but to declare him reconciled? *But it ſaith not without the Deſire of it*. Suppoſe not, yet the thing is done upon the Deſire, and therefore the Prieſt's Power can be no more than declarative. And that ſuch a Deſire is ſo neceſſary, as without it, Contrition avails not, is more than the Council hath proved, and it is barely ſuppoſed, to maintain the Neceſſity of going to the Prieſt for *Abſolution*; and ſo it will be no more than a Precept of the Church, and not a Condition of Remiſſion in the Sacrament of Penance, but afterwards, it declares, *That imperfect Contrition or Attrition doth diſpoſe a Man for the Grace of God in this Sacrament*;

*Sacrament*; and by the general Canons, *the Sacraments do confer Grace where Men are diſpoſed.* So that the Council of *Trent* did rightly comprehend the Force of the *Power* of *Abſolution*, which it gave to the *Prieſt* in this Sacrament of *Penance.*

But what *Catholick Tradition* could there be for the Doctrine of the *Council* of *Trent* in this matter, when *Hadrian VI.* ſo little before it declares, *it was a great Difficulty among the Doctors, whether the Keys of Prieſthood did extend to the Remiſſion of the Fault?* And for the *Negative*, he produces *Pet. Lombard. Alex. Alenſ.* and *Bonaventure*; and ſaith, *that Opinion is probable, becauſe the Prieſts Power of binding and looſing is equal*; *and as they cannot bind where God doth not, for they cannot retain the Sins of a true Penitent*; *ſo neither can they looſe where God doth not, i. e.* where there is not *true Contrition.* But becauſe he ſaith *others held the contrary Opinion, and had Probability on their ſide too, therefore he would determine nothing.* Notwithſtanding this, in a few years after, the Council of *Trent* finds no Difficulty, no Probability in the other Opinion; but determines as boldly, as if there had been an *Univerſal Tradition* their way; whereas the contrary cannot be denied by any that are converſant in the Doctrine of their *Schools.* But it was the mighty Privilege of the Council of *Trent*, to make the Doctrines of *Thomas* and *Scotus*, when they agreed, to be *Articles of Faith*; and to denounce *Anathema's* againſt Oppoſers, although they reached to ſome of the greateſt Divines of their own Church, within *Bellarmine's* compaſs of 500 *Years.*

Hadrian. *Quodlib. q.* 5. 3. *princip.*

## Of Extreme Unction.

We are now to examin another pretended Sacrament, *viz.* of *Extreme Unction.* The Council of *Trent* declares this to be *a true and proper Sacrament, and denounces an Anathema againſt him that denies it to be inſtituted by Chriſt, and publiſhed by S.* James; *or that it confers Grace and Remiſſion of Sins*; *or that affirms it was appointed for bodily Cures*: *It farther declares from the place of S.* James *interpreted by Tradition, that the Matter is Oil conſecrated by the Biſhop*; *the Form, that which is now uſed,* Per iſtam Unctionem, &c. *the Effect, the Grace of the Holy Ghoſt in purging away the remainder of Sin, and ſtrengthening the Soul*; *and ſometimes bodily Cures, when it is expedient for the Health of the Soul.* So that the primary Intention of this Sacrament muſt reſpect the Soul, otherwiſe it is granted, it could not be a *true and proper Sacrament.* So *Suarez* ſaith in this Caſe, *If the external Sign be not immediately appointed for a ſpiritual Effect, it cannot prove a true Sacrament of the New Law*; *no, not although the bodily Cure were deſigned for the ſtrengthening of Faith.* And from hence he proves, *that when the Apoſtles are ſaid to anoint the ſick, and heal them,* Mark 6. 13. *this cannot relate to the Sacrament of Unction, becauſe their Cures had not of themſelves an immediate Reſpect to the Soul.* The ſame Reaſon is uſed by *Bellarmine*, *Sacramenta per ſe ad animam pertinent, ad corpus per accidens aut certè ſecundariò.* The ſame is affirmed by *Maldonat*, although he differs from *Bellarmine* about the Apoſtles *anointing with Oil*, which *Bellarmine* denies to have been *Sacramental* for this Reaſon, but *Maldonat* affirms it; and anſwers other Arguments of *Bellarmine*, but not this.

*Concil.* Trid. *Seſſ.* 14. *Can.* 1, 2. *cap.* 1, 2, 3:

Suarez *in* 3. *part. diſp.* 39. *Sect.* 1. *n.* 5.

Bell. *de Extr. Unct. c.* 2.

Mald. *de Sacram. Extr. Unct. q.* 2.

*Gregory de Valentia* carries it farther, and ſaith, *That if the anointing with Oil were only a Symbol of a miraculous Cure, it could be no Sacrament*; *for that is a Medium to convey ſupernatural Grace, and then it would laſt no longer than the Gift of Miracles.*

Greg. de Val. *To.* 4. *Diſp.* 8. *Q.* 1. *Punct.* 1.

So

So that we have no more to do, but only to prove that by the *Tradition* of the Church S. *James* his *anointing* was to be underſtood to *bodily Cures* in the firſt Place.

We cannot paſs over ſo great a Man as *Cajetan*, who wrote on that place of S. *James*, not long before the Council of *Trent*, and a good while after the Council of *Florence*, which relies on this place for this *Sacrament of Unction*. But *Cajetan* ſaith, *it doth not relate to it, becauſe the immediate Effect is the Cure of the Party in S.* James; *but in this Sacrament the direct and proper Effect is Remiſſion of Sins.* All that *Catherinus* hath to ſay againſt this, is, *that the bodily Cure is not repugnant to it*; but what is this to the Purpoſe, when the Queſtion is, what is primarily deſigned in this place?

Cath. *Annot. in Comment.* Cajet. l. 5. *p.* 464

The *School Divines*, from *Peter Lombard*, had generally received this for a *Sacrament*; but the *Canoniſts* denied it, as appears by the *Gloſs* on *c. Vir autem de Secund. Nuptiis Decret. Gregor. Tit.* 21. where it is ſaid, *That this Unction might be repeated, being no Sacrament, but only Prayer over a Perſon.* The *Roman Correctors* cry out *it is Hereſie by the Council of* Trent; but the *Gloſſer* knew no ſuch thing; and if it were ſo only by the Council of *Trent*, then not by any *Catholick Tradition* before. For, I ſuppoſe matter of *Hereſie* muſt reach to the *Canoniſts*, as well as the *Divines*.

But the plaineſt Determination of this matter will be by the ancient *Offices* of the Church; for if they reſpected *bodily Cures* in the firſt place, then it is owned there could be no *Tradition* for any *Sacrament* in this *Unction*.

In the ancient *Ordo Romanus* it is called *Benedictio Olei ad omnem Languorem quocunque tempore*. I deſire to know whether the *Oil* ſo conſecrated be chiefly deſigned for the *Body* or the *Soul*. And in the *Office* it ſelf, this place of S. *James* is mention'd: and then follows, *Te Domine peritiſſimum Medicum imploramus ut virtutis tuæ Medicinam in hoc Oleum propitius infundas*. And a little after, *Proſit Pater Miſericordiarum, febribus & dyſenteriâ laborantibus, proſit paralyticis, cæcis & claudis ſimúlque vexatitiis*, with abundance more; which manifeſtly ſhews, that this conſecrated *Oil* was intended primarily for the *Cure* of *Diſeaſes*.

In the *Ambroſian Form*, the Prayer is, *Infunde ſanctificationem tuam huic Oleo, ut ab his quæ unxerit membra, fugatis inſidiis adverſariæ poteſtatis, ſuſceptione præſentis Olei, Sancti Spiritus Gratia ſalutaris debiltatem expellet & plenam conferat ſoſpitatem.* Where the Effect relates to the ſoundneſs of the Members anointed, and not to the Sins committed by them.

*Sacr.* Greg. *p.* 252.

In the *Gregorian Sacramentary* publiſhed by *Menardus*, there is a *Prayer* wherein this place of S. *James* is mentioned; and preſently it follows, *Cura quæſumus Redemptor noſter Gratia Spiritus Sancti languores iſtius infirmi, &c*, and immediately before the anointing, *Sana Domine infirmum iſtum, cujus oſſa turbata ſunt, &c.* and while he was anointing, the Patient was to ſay, *Sana me Domine*; and where the Pain was greateſt, he was to be ſo much more anointed, *ubi plus dolor imminet amplius perungatur*, while the reſt were anointing, one of the Prieſts was to pray, *priſtinam & immelioratam recipere merearis ſanitatem*, what was this but bodily Health? and yet this was *per hanc Sacramenti Olei Unctionem*; After which follows a long Prayer for *Recovery* from *Pains and Diſeaſes*.

And

And such there are in the several *Offices* published by *Menardus* in his *Notes*; although the general Strain of them, shews that they were of latter times, when the *Unction* was supposed to expiate the Sins of the several Senses.

*Cassander* produces many Instances to shew, that the *Prayers* and *Hymns*, and the *Form* of anointing did respect *bodily Health*. In one he finds this Form, *In nomine Patris, & Filii, & Spiritus Sancti accipe sanitatem.* Not the *health* of the *Mind*, but the *Body*. Cassand. *not. in* Hymn. *p.* 288.

*Maldonat* takes notice of *Cassander*'s Offices, and the Expressions used in them; but he gives no Answer to the main design of them. But three things he owns the *Church* of *Rome* to have varied from the *ancient Tradition* in, with respect to this *Sacrament*. 1. As to the *Form*; the Council of *Trent* owns no other but that now used, *Per istam Unctionem, &c.* but *Maldonat* confesses it was Indicative, *Ego te unge, &c.* or *Ungo te Oleo sancto, &c* and he runs to that shift, *that Christ did not determine any certain Form*; whereas the *Council* of *Trent* saith, *the Church understood by Tradition the other to have been the Form.* Here the Council of *Trent* makes an Appeal to *Tradition*, and is deserted in it, by one of its most zealous Defenders; and *Gamachæus* affirms this to be *an essential Change*; and he thinks the *Sacrament* not to be valid in another *Form*. *Suarez* thinks *the other Form not sufficient*. But *Maldonat* affirms *the other Form was used*; and so at that time, there was no *Sacrament* of *extreme Unction* because not administred in a valid or sufficient *Form*. And yet in the *Gregorian Office* the *Form* is *Indicative*, *Inungo te de Oleo sancto, &c.* So in that of *Ratoldus*, *Ungo te Oleo sanctificato in nomine Patris, &c.* In the *Tilidn Codex*, *Inungo te in nomine Patris & Filii, & Spiritus Sancti, Oleo Sancto atque sacrato, &c.* In the *Codex Remigii* the general *Forms* are *Indicative*, *Ungo te Oleo sancto, &c.* but there being variety of *Forms* set down, among the rest there is one, *Per istam Unctionem Dei, &c.* Which afterwards came to be the standing Form; and yet the Council of *Trent* confidently appeals to *Tradition* in this Matter. Which shew'd how very little the *Divines* there met were skilled in the *Antiquities* of their own *Church*. *Suarez* shews his Skill when he saith, *the Tradition of the Roman Church is infallible in the Substance of this Sacrament, and that it always used a deprecative Form*; but *Maldonat* knew better, and therefore on their own Grounds their *Tradition* was more than fallible; since the Roman Church hath actually changed the *Form* of this *Sacrament*. 2. *Maldonat* observes another *Change*, and that is as to the *Season* of administring it. For the *Council* of *Trent* saith it ought to be in *Exitu vitæ*, and therefore it is called *Sacramentum Exeuntium*, *the Sacrament of dying Persons*; but *Maldonat* saith, *it is an Abuse to give it only to such*; *for*, *in the ancient Church*, *they did not wait till the Party were near Death*; *but*, he saith, *it was given before the Eucharist, and that not once, but for seven Days together, as is plain*, he saith *in the ancient MS. Offices*; and he quotes *Albertus Magnus* for it. So that here is another great *Change* in the *Roman Tradition* observed and owned by him. 3. In not giving it now to Children; for in the ancient Writers he saith, *there is no Exception, but it was used to all that were sick*; and he quotes *Cusanus* for saying expressly *that it was anciently administred to Infants.* But the Reason of the *Change* was the Doctrine of the *Schoolmen*; for with their admirable Congruities they had fitted *Sacraments* for all sorts of Sins; as *Bellarmine* informs us; *Baptism* against *Original Sin*, *Confirmation*

Maldonat. *de Sacram. extr. Unct. q.* 1.

Gamach. *de Extr. Unct. c.* 3.

Suarez. *in* 3. *part. Disp.* 40. *Sect.* 3.

Greg. *Sacr. p.* 252.

Menard. *Not. p.* 337.

*p.* 342.

*p* 353.

*p.* 352.

Suarez. *ibid.*

*c.* 3.

Mald. *ib. q.* 3.

Bell. *de Sacr. l.* 2. *c.* 25. *c.* 2.

*mation* againſt *Infirmity*; *Penance* againſt *actual Mortal Sin*, *Euchariſt* againſt *Malice*, *Orders* againſt *Ignorance*, *Matrimony* againſt *Concupiſcence*; and what is now left for *Extreme Unction*? *Bellarmine* ſaith, *they are the Remainders of Sin*; and ſo ſaith the Council of *Trent*. But what Remainders are there in Children, who have not actually ſinned, and *Original Sin* is done away already? Therefore the Church of *Rome* did wiſely take away *Extreme Unction* from Children; but therein *Maldonat* confeſſes it is gone off from Tradition. I know *Algambe* would have *Maldonat* not believed to be the Author of the Books of the Sacraments; but the Preface before his Works, hath cleared this beyond Contradiction from the *MS.* taken from his Mouth, with the Day and Year; compared with the Copy printed under his Name. But if *Maldonat* may be believed, the Church of *Rome* hath notoriouſly gone off from its on Tradition, as to the Sacrament of *Extreme Unction*.

## *Of* Matrimony.

The laſt new *Sacrament* is that of *Matrimony*; which having its Inſtitution in *Paradiſe*, one would wonder how it came into Mens Heads to call it a *Sacrament of the New Law, inſtituted by Chriſt*; eſpecially, when the Grace given by it ſuppoſes Mankind in a fallen Condition.

*Conc.* Trid. *Seſſ.* 24. *c.* 1. However, the Council of *Trent* denounces an *Anathema* againſt him that ſaith, *that Matrimony is not truly and properly a Sacrament, one of the Seven of the Evangelical Law, inſtituted by Chriſt.*

That which is truly and properly a Sacrament, muſt be a Cauſe of Grace, according to the general Decrees about the Nature of Sacraments. So that thoſe who do not hold the latter, muſt deny the former.

Now that there was no Tradition, even in the *Roman* Church, for this, I prove from the Confeſſion of their own moſt Learned Divines ſince the Council of *Trent*.

Vaſq. *de Sacr. Matrim. Diſp.* 2. *c.* 1. *Vaſquez* confeſſes that *Durandus* denies that it confers *Grace*, and conſequently, that it is truly a Sacrament (but he yields it in a large improper Senſe) *and that the Canoniſts were of his Opinion*; *and that the Maſter of the Sentences himſelf aſſerted no more than* Durandus. And

*c.* 3. which adds more to this, he confeſſes that *Soto* doth not condemn this Opinion as *heretical*, becauſe *Thomas*, *Bonaventure*, *Scotus*, and other Schoolmen did only look on their own as the more probable Opinion. But, ſaith he, *after the Decree of* Eugenius *and the Council of* Trent *it is heretical.*

Greg. de Val. *To.* 4. *Diſp.* 10. *Punct.* 5. *Gregory de Valentia* ſaith the ſame thing, only he adds, That the *Maſter* of the *Sentences* contradicts himſelf. So certain a Deliverer was he of the *Churches Tradition*; and wonders that *Soto* ſhould not find it plainly enough in the the Councils of *Florence* and *Trent*, that a *true Sacrament muſt confer Grace.*

Mald. *de Sac. Matrim. q.* 1. *Maldonat* yields, that *Durandus* and the *Canoniſts* deny'd Matrimony to be a proper Sacrament, but he calls them, *Catholicks imprudently erring.*

Bell. *de Matr. Sacr. l.* 1. *c.* 5. *Bellarmine* denies it not, but uſes a diſingenuous Shift about *Durandus*, and would bring it to a Logical Nicety, whereas the very Arguments he pretends to anſwer, ſhew plainly that he deny'd this to be a *true and proper Sacrament.*

But he offers ſomething conſiderable about the *Canoniſts*, if it will hold. 1. *That*

1. *That they were but a few*; and for this he quotes *Navarr*, *that the common Opinion was against them*; for which he mentions the *Rubrick de Sponſ.* but I can find nothing like it thro' the whole Title; and it is not at all probable that ſuch Men as *Hoſtienſis*, and the *Gloſſer*, ſhould be ignorant of, or oppoſe the common Opinion. *Hoſtienſis* ſaith plainly, *that Grace is not conferr'd by Matrimony*, and never once mentions any Opinion among them againſt it; and the *Gloſſer* upon *Gratian* affirms in ſeveral times, *Cauſ.* 32. *q.* 2. *c. Honorantur*, *in hoc Sacramento non confertur Gratia Spiritûs Sancti ſicut in aliis.* The *Roman Correctors* could not bear this; and ſay in the Margin, *immo confert*; this is plain contradicting; but how is it prov'd from the *Canon Law?* They refer to *Diſt.* 23. *c. his igitur*, *v. pro beneficiis.* Thither upon their Authority I go, and there I find the very ſame thing ſaid, and in the ſame words; and it is given as a Reaſon, why *Simony* cannot be committed in *Matrimony* as in other *Sacraments*, and in both places we are referr'd to 32. *q.* 2. *c. connubia.* and to 1. *q.* 1. *c. quicquid inviſibilis*, the former is not very favourable to the Grace of Matrimony, and in the latter, the *Gloſs* is yet more plain, if it be poſſible, *Nota Conjugium non eſſe de his Sacramentis quæ conſolationem cœleſtis gratiæ tribuunt.* There the Correctors fairly refer us to the Council of *Trent*, which hath decreed the contrary. But that is not to our Buſineſs, but whether the *Canoniſts* owned this or not. And there it follows, *that other* Sacraments *do ſo ſignifie as to convey*, *this barely ſignifies.* So that I think *Bellarmine* had as good have given up the Canoniſts, as to make ſo lame a Defence of them.

Navar. *Man. c.* 22. *n.* 20.

Hoſtienſ. *Sum. de Sacr. non iter. n.* 7.

2. He ſaith, We are not to rely on the *Canoniſts* for theſe things, but on the *Divines*. But *Durandus* ſaith, The *Canoniſts* could not be ignorant of the Doctrine of the *Roman* Church; for ſome of them were *Cardinals*; and he gives a better Reaſon, *viz.* That the Senſe of the *Roman* Church was to be ſeen in the Decretals. For therefore Marriage was owned to be a Sacrament in the large Senſe, becauſe of the *Decret.* of *Lucius* III. *Extra de hæret. c. ad abolendam*; but the Schoolmen argued from Probabilities and Niceties in this Matter, which could not ſatisfie a Man's Underſtanding; as appears by *Durandus* his Arguments, and *Bellarmine*'s Anſwers to them.

Durand. *in ſent. l.* 4. *Diſt.* 26. *q.* 3.

1. *Where Sacraments confer Grace there muſt be a Divine Inſtitution of ſomething above Natural Reaſon, but there is nothing of that kind in Matrimony, beſides the ſignifying the Union between Chriſt and his Church; and therefore it is only a* Sacrament *in a large, and not in a proper Senſe.*

In anſwer to this *Bellarmine* ſaith, *That it both ſignifies and cauſes ſuch a Love between Man and Wife, as there is between Chriſt and his Church.*

Bell. *de Sacr. Matr. c.* 1. *c.* 5.

But *Vaſquez* ſaith, *That the Reſemblance as to Chriſt and his Church in Matrimony, doth not at all prove a Promiſe of Grace made to it.* And *Baſilius Pontius* approves of what *Vaſquez* ſaith, and confeſſes that it cannot be inferr'd from hence that it is a true and proper Sacrament.

Vaſq. *de Sacr. Matr. Diſp.* 2. *c.* 6. Baſil. Pont. *de Matr. l.* 1. *c.* 5. *n.* 10.

2. *Here is nothing external added, beſides the mere Contract of the Perſons; but the Nature of a* Sacrament *implies ſome external and viſible Sign.*

*Bellarmine* anſwers, That it is not neceſſary there ſhould be in this Sacrament any ſuch extrinſecal Sign; becauſe it lies in a mere Contract. And that I think holds on the other ſide, that a mere Contract cannot be a Sacrament.

3. *The Marriage of Infidels was good and valid, and their Baptiſm adds nothing to it; but it was no* Sacrament *before, and therefore not after.*

*Bellarmine* anſwers, That it becomes a Sacrament after. And ſo there is a *Sacrament* without either *Matter* or *Form*; for there is no new Marriage.

4. *Marriage was inſtituted in the time of Innocency, and is a natural Dictate of Reaſon,* and therefore no Sacrament.

*Bellarmine* anſwers, *That it was no* Sacrament *then, becauſe there was no need of* Sacramental-Grace. *And altho' the Marriage of* Adam *and* Eve *did repreſent the Union between Chriſt and his Church, yet it was no proper* Sacrament. But how doth he prove that it is a Sacrament upon any other Account, under the Goſpel? And if that doth not imply a Promiſe of Grace then, how can it now?

So that *Durandus* his Reaſons appear much ſtronger than *Bellarmine*'s Anſwers.

But *Durandus* urges one thing more, which *Bellarmine* takes no notice of, *viz.* That this Opinion of the Canoniſts was very well known at that time, and was never condemn'd as contrary to any Determination of the Church. Now if there had been any conſtant *Tradition* even of the Church of *Rome* againſt it, it is impoſſible theſe Canoniſts ſhould have avoided Cenſure; their Opinion being ſo much taken notice of by the Schoolmen afterwards. *Jocobus Almain* ſaith, *It was a* Controverſie *between the* Canoniſts *and* Divines, *whether* Matrimony *was a* Sacrament; not all the Divines neither; for he confeſſes, *Durandus* and others ſeem'd to agree with them. What Univerſal Tradition then had the Council of *Trent* to rely upon in this Matter? When all the Canoniſts, according to *Almain*, and ſome of the *Divines*, oppoſed it? He ſets down their different Reaſons, but never alledges matter of Faith or Tradition againſt them, but only ſaith, The Divines hold the other Opinion, becauſe Matrimony is one of the Seven Sacraments. But on what was the Opinion of the Neceſſity of *Seven Sacraments* grounded? What Scripture, what Fathers, what Tradition was there before *Peter Lombard*, for juſt that Number?

Almain *in* 4. *Diſt*, 26. *q.* 1.

### *The Senſe of the* Greek *Church about* Seven Sacraments.

But before I come to that, it is fit to take notice of what *Bellarmine* lays great Weight upon, both as to the Number of Sacraments in general, and this in particular; which is, the Conſent of both the *Greek* and *Latin* Church for at leaſt 500 Years. But I have ſhew'd there was no ſuch Conſent, as is boaſted of even in the *Latin* Church. As to the *Greek* Church, he ſaith, *It is an Argument of Univerſal Tradition, when they had the ſame Tradition even in their* Schiſm.

Bell. *de Sacr. l.* 2. *c.* 25. *De Matrim. Sacr. l.* 1 *c.* 4.

To this I anſwer,

1. We do not deny that the later *Greeks*, after the taking *Conſtantinople* by the *Latins*, did hold Seven Myſteries; which the *Latins* render Sacraments. For after there were *Latin* Patriarchs at *Conſtantinople*, and abundance of *Latin* Prieſts in the Eaſtern Parts, they had perpetual Diſputes about Religion; and the *Latins* by degrees did gain upon them in ſome Points; and particularly in this of *Seven Sacraments*, for the *Latins* thought it an Advantage to their Church to boaſt of ſuch a Number of Sacraments; and the *Greeks*, that they might not ſeem to come behind them, were willing to embrace the ſame Number.

The

The first Person among them, who is said to have written about them, was *Simeon* Bishop of *Thessalonica*, whom *Possevin* sets at a greater Distance, that the *Tradition* might seem so much elder among them; (for he makes them to have liv'd 600 Years before his time;) but *Leo Allatius* hath evidently prov'd, that he liv'd not two Hundred Years before him, (which is a considerable Difference) for *Simeon* dy'd but six Months before the taking of *Thessalonica*, *A. D.* 1430. as he proves from *Joh. Anagnosta*, who was present at the taking of it. From hence it appears how very late this *Tradition* came into the *Greek Church*.

Possev. *in Appar.* Leo Allat. *de Concord. l.* 2. *c.* 18. *n.* 13. *De* Simeon. *Script. p.* 185. *&c.*

After him *Gabriel Severus*, Bishop of *Philadelphia*, wrote about the *Seven Sacraments*, and he liv'd at *Venice* in *Arcudius* his time, who wrote since *Possevin*; and *Crusius* wrote to this *Gabriel*, *Anno Dom.* 1580. and he was consecrated by *Jeremias Anno Dom.* 1577. So that neither his *Authority*, or that of *Jeremias*, can signifie any thing as to the *Antiquity* of this *Tradition* among the *Greeks*.

Crusii *Turco Græc.*

*Leo Allatius* talks of the Old as well as the Modern *Greeks*, who held *Seven Secraments*, but he produces the Testimony only of those who liv'd since the taking of *Constantinople*; as *Job* the Monk, *Simeon*, *Johannes Palæologus*, *Jeremias*, *Gabriel*, *Cyrillus Berrhoensis*, *Parthenius*, and such like: But he very craftily saith, He produces these to let us see they have not gone off from the Face of their Ancestours, whereas that is the thing we would have seen, *viz.* the Testimony of the *Greeks* before, and not afterwards. As to the ancient *Greeks*, he confesses they say nothing of the Number. *De numero apud eos altum silentium est.* And how could there be a Tradition in so much Silence? *But some speak of some, and others of others, but all speak of all.* This is a very odd way to prove a Tradition of a certain Number. For then, some might believe Three, others Four, others Five, but how can this prove that all believed just Seven? However let us see the Proof. But instead of that he presently starts an Objection frm the pretended *Dionysius Areopagita*, viz. *That where he designs to treat of all the* Sacraments *he never mentions* Penance, Extreme Unction, *and* Matrimony; and after a great deal of rambling Discourse, he concludes *that he did ill to leave 'em out*; *and that others Answers are insufficient.* He shews from *Tertullian*, *Ambrose* and *Cyril*, that the necessary Sacraments are mention'd; but where are the rest? And we are now enquiring after them in the ancient *Greek* Church; but they are not to be found. As one may confidently affirm, when one who profess'd so much Skill in the *Greek* Church, as *Leo Allatius*, hath no more to say for the Proof of it.

Leo Allat. *de Concord. l.* 3. *c.* 16. *n.* 4.

*n.* 9.

*n.* 10.

*n.* 15.

*n.* 17.

2. Those *Greeks* who held *Seven Sacraments*, did not hold them in the Sense of the Council of *Trent*. And that for two Reasons:

1. They do not hold them all to be of *Divine Institution*. Which appears by the Patriarch *Jeremias* his Answer to the *Tubing Divines*, who at first seems to write agreeably to the Church of *Rome* in this matter, (except about Extreme Unction;) but being press'd hard by them in their Reply; he holds *to the Divine Institution of Baptism and the Eucharist*, but gives up the rest, *as instituted by the Churches Authority*. Which is plain giving up the Cause. How then comes *Bellarmine* to insist so muc on the Answer of *Jeremias?* The Reason was, that *Socolovius* had procur'd from *Constantinople* the *Patriarch's first Answer*, and translated and Printed it; upon which, great Triumph's were made of the Patriarch's Consent with the Church of *Rome*; but when these Divines were hereby provok'd to publish the whole Proceedings,

*Act. Theolog.* Wirtemberg. *p.* 240.

those of the Church of *Rome* were unwilling to be undeceiv'd; and so take no Notice of any farther Answer. Since the time of *Jeremias*, the *Patriarch* of *Alexandria*, (as he was afterwards,) *Metrophanes Critopulus* publisht an Account of the Faith of the *Greek Church*; and he saith expresly of Four of the Seven, that *they are Mystical Rites, and equivocally called Sacraments.* And from hence it appears how little Reason *Leo Allatius* had to be angry with *Caucus*, a Latinized Greek, like himself, for affirming *that the modern Greeks did not look on these Sacraments as of Divine Institution*; but after he hath given him some hard words, he offers to prove his Assertion for him. To which end he not only quotes that passage of the Patriarch *Jeremias* but others of *Job* and *Gregorius*; from whence he infers, *that Five of the Sacraments were of Ecclesiastical Institution*, and he saith nothing to take it off. So admirably hath he proved the *Consent* of the *Eastern* and *Western Churches!*

Metroph. *Confess. Eccl.* Orient. *p.* 74.

Leo Allat. *de Concord. Eccl.* Occident. & Orient. *l.* 3. *c.* 17.

2. They do not agree in the *Matter* or *Form*, or some essential part of them, with the Council of *Trent*, and therefore can make up no *Tradition* for the *Doctrine* of that *Council* about the *Seven Sacraments.* This will be made appear by going through them.

### 1. *Of* Chrism.

1. As to the *Form*, *Arcudius* shews, *that* Gabriel *of* Philadelphia, Cabasilas *and* Marcus Ephesius, *all place the Form in the Consecration of it*; but the *Church* of *Rome* makes the *Form* to lie in the *Words spoken in the Use of it.*

Arcud. *de Concord. l.* 2. *c.* 6.

2. As to the *Minister* of it. Among the *Greeks* it is commonly performed by the *Presbyter*, though the *Bishop be present*; but the *Council* of *Trent* denounces an *Anathema* against him that saith, *the Bishop alone is not the Minister of it.*

*Concil.* Trid. *de Confirm. Can.* 3.

3. As to the *Character.* The Council of *Trent* declares, *That whosoever affirms that Confirmation doth not imprint an indelible Character, so as it cannot be repeated, is Anathematized*; but *Arcudius* shews at large, that the *modern Greeks* make no scruple of *reiterating Confirmation.* But *Catumsyritus*, another *Latinized Greek*, opposes *Arcudius* herein; and saith, *that the Use of Chrism among the Greeks, doth not relate to the Sacrament of Confirmation, but was a Symbolical Ceremony relating to Baptism*; and for this he quotes one *Corydaleus* a Man of great Note in the *Patriarchal Church* at *Constantinople*, Therefore *Caucus* had Reason to deny that the Greeks receive that which the Latins call the Sacrament of Confirmation. And if this hold, then the *Tradition* of the *Seven Sacraments* must fail in the *Greek Church.* For they deny that they have any such thing as a *Sacrament* of *Confirmation* distinct from *Baptism.*

*De Sacram. Can.* 9.

Arcud. *l.* 2. *c.* 18, 19, 20, *&c.*

Catumsyrit. *Vera utriusq; Eccl. Concord. Proleg. p.* 114.

### 2. *Of the Sacrament of* Penance.

1. The Council of *Trent* declares *Absolution of the Penance to be a judicial Act, denounces an Anathema against him that denies it*; but the *Greek Church* uses a *deprecative Form*, (as they call it,) not pronouncing *Absolution* by way of *Sentence*, but by way of *Prayer to God.* Which, as *Aquinas* observes, *rather shews a Person to be absolved by God than by the Priest, and are rather a Prayer that it may be done, than a signification that it is done*; and therefore he looks on such *Forms* as insuffi-

*Concil.* Trid. *de Pœnit. c.* 6. *can.* 9.

Aq. 3. *p. q.* 84. *a.* 3. *ad.* 1.

cient

cient. And if it be a *judicial Sentence*, as the Council of *Trent* determines it can hardly be reconciled to such a *Form*, wherein no kind of *judicial Sentence* was ever pronounced; as *Arcudius* grants; and in Extreme *Unction* where such a *Form* is allowed, there is, as he observes, no *judicial Act*. But he hopes at last to bring the *Greeks* off by a Phrase used in some of their Forms, *I have you absolved*; but he confesses it is not in their *Publick Offices*; and their Priests for the most part use it not. Which shews it to be an Innovation among the *Latinizing Greeks*, if it be so observed, which *Catumsyritus* denies, and saith, *he proves it only from some Forms granted by Patents*, which are not *Sacramental*; and supposing it otherwise, he saith, *it is foolish, false and erroneous to suppose such a Form to be valid; because it is no judicial Act.* Arcud. *de Concord.* 4. *l.* c. 3. *p.* 360. *p.* 370. Catumsyrit. *de vera Conc. Proleg. p.* 153.

2. The Council of *Trent* makes *Confession* of all mortal Sins, how secret soever, to be necessary in order to the Benefit of *Priestly Absolution* in this *Sacrament*, and denounces an *Anathema* against those that deny it; but the *Greek Church* grants *Absolution* upon Supposition *that they have not confessed all mortal Sins:* As appears by the Form of the *Patriarch* of *Antioch*, produced by *Arcudius*, and another *Form* of the *Patriarch* of *Constantinople*, in *Jeremias* his Answer. *Arcudius* is hard put to it, when to excuse this he saith, *they only pray to God to forgive them*; for this is to own that a *deprecative Form* is insufficient, and so that there is no *Sacrament* of *Penance* in the *Greek Church.* *Concil.* Trid. *de Pœnit. c.* 5. *Can.* 7. Arcud. *p.* 373.

## 3. *Of* Orders.

The *Greek and Latin Churches* differ, both as to *Matter and Form*. The Council of *Trent Anathematizes* those *who deny a visible and external Priesthood in the New Testament*; *or a Power of Consecrating and offering the true Body and Blood of Christ, and of remitting and retaining of Sins.* And this twofold *Power* the Church of *Rome* expresses by a double *Form*, one of *delivering the Vessels with* Accipe potestatem, &c. *the other of Imposition of Hands, with* Accipe Spiritum Sanctum. *Sess.* 23. *de Sacr. Ordin. Can.* 1.

But the *Greek Church* wholly omits the former, on which the greatest weight is laid in the *Latin Church*, and many think the *Essential Form* lies in it. When the *Office* of *Ordination* is over, the *Book* of the *Liturgy*, called Κοντάκιον, is delivered to the Presbyter, but without any words; and there is no mention of it in their *Rituals*, either Printed or MSS. So likewise a parcel of consecrated Bread is delivered by the *Bishop* to him afterwards. And all the Form is, *The Divine Grace advances such a one to the Office of a Presbyter.*

If we compare this with the *Form* in the Council of *Florence*, we shall find no Agreement either as to *Matter* or *Form*, in this Sacrament, between the *Greek* and *Latin Churches.* For there the *Matter* is said to be *that by which the Order is conferred.* viz. *the delivery of the Chalice with Wine, and the Paten with the Bread*; and the *Form*, *Receive the Power of offering Sacrifice for the living and the dead.* And it is hardly possible to suppose these two Churches should go upon the same *Tradition.* I know what pains *Arcudius* hath taken to reconcile them; but as long as the Decree of *Eugenius* stands, and is received in the Church of *Rome*, it is impossible. And *Catumsyritus* labours hard to prove, *that he hath endeavoured thereby to overthrow the whole Order of Priesthood in the Roman Church.*

4. *Of*

## 4. Of Extreme Unction.

Bell. *de Extr. Unct. l.* 1. *c.* 4.

*Bellarmine* particularly appeals to the *Greek Church* for its Consent as to this *Sacrament*; but if he means in the modern sense as it is deliver'd by the Councils of *Florence* and *Trent*, he is extremely mistaken.

1. For the former saith, *It is not to be given but to such, of whose death they are afraid*; and the Council of *Trent* calls it *the Sacrament of dying Persons*. But the *Greeks* administer their *Sacrament* of *Unction* to *Persons in health* as well as sickness, and once a year to all the People that will; which *Arcudius* saith, *is not only done by the illiterate Priests, but by their Patriarchs and Metropolitans, &c.* and they look on it then as *a Supplement to the ancient Penance of the Church*; for they think the partaking of *the holy Oil* makes amends for that. But this *Arcudius* condemns as an Abuse and Innovation among them. But the original Intention and Design of it was for the Cure and Recovery of sick Persons; as *Arcudius* confesses the whole scope of the *Office* shews; and in the next Chapter he produces the *Prayers* to that end. And the *Greeks* charge the *Latins* with *Innovation* in giving this *Sacrament* to those Persons of whose *Recovery* they have no hope.

Arcud. *de Concord. l.* 5. *c.* 4.

*p.* 389.

*c.* 5.

*c.* 7. *p.* 403.

Conc. Trid. *de Extr. Unct. c.* 1.

Catumsyr. *Vera Concord. Tr.* 1. *p.* 156.

Arcud. *l.* 5. *c.* 2.

2. the Council of *Trent* requires that the Oil of Extreme Unction be consecrated by a *Bishop*; and this the Doctors of the Roman Church, saith *Catumsyritus*, make *essential to the Sacrament*. But in the Greek Church the *Presbyters* commonly do it, as *Arcudius* shews at large.

## 5. Of Matrimony.

Conc. Trid. *Sess.* 24. *Can.* 7.

The Council of *Trent* from making this a *Sacrament* denounces an *Anathema* against those who do not hold the Bond indissoluble even in the Case of Adultery. And *Bellarmine* urges this as his first Reason, *because it is a Sign of the Conjunction of Christ with his Church*. But the *Greek Church* held the contrary; and continues so to do, as both *Bellarmine* and *Arcudius* confess.

Bell. *de Matr. l.* 1. *c.* 16.

So that though there be allow'd a Consent in the *Number of Sacraments* among the modern *Greeks*; yet they have not an entire Consent with the Roman Church in any one of them.

### *The Sense of the Eastern Churches about the Seven Sacraments.*

But to shew how late this Tradition of Seven Sacraments came into the *Greek Church*, and how far it is from being an *Universal Tradition*, I shall now make it appear, that this Number of Sacraments was never received in the other Christian Churches, although some of them were originally descended from the ancient *Greek Church*.

I begin with the most *Eastern Churches*, called the *Christians* of S. *Thomas* in the *East Indies*. And we have a clear Proof that there was no Tradition among them about the Seven Sacraments. For when *Alexius Menezes*, Archbishop of *Goa*, undertook to reform them according to the *Roman Church*, (if that may be called a *Reformation*) and held a Council at *Diamper* to that purpose, *A. D.* 1599. he found *that they had no Sacrament of Chrism, or Penance, or Extreme Unction, of which they were utterly ignorant*, saith *Jarricus* from *Antonius Govèanus*, who

Pet. Jarric. *Rer. Judic. To.* 3. *p.* 2. *c.* 12.

was

was *Prior* of *Goa*, and publiſhed the whole proceedings Which Book was tranſlated out of *Portugeſe* by *Joh. Baptiſta à Glano* into *French*, and Printed at *Bruſſels* 1609. From whence the Author of the *Critical Hiſtory* of the *Faith and Cuſtoms of the Eaſtern Nations* hath given an Account of theſe things; and he ſaith, *they owned but three Sacraments, Baptiſm, Euchariſt and Orders; that they knew nothing of the Sacrament of Chriſm or Extreme Unction, and abhorred Auricular Confeſſion.* But in Excuſe of them, he ſaith, *that they joyned Confirmation with Baptiſm, as other Eaſtern Churches did; that the Sacrament of Extreme Unction, as it is practis'd in the Church of* Rome, *is known only to the Latin Church; but the Eaſtern Church had the Unction of S.* James *for the Cure of Diſeaſes, as the Greek Church had.*

*Hiſtorie Critique, ch.* 8. *p.* 104. *p.* 105. *p.* 112. *p.* 113. *p.* 13.

*Cotovicus* affirms the ſame of the other *Eaſtern* Churches called *Chaldean*, (who are under the ſame Patriarch with the Chriſtians of S *Thomas)* that they knew nothing of the *Sacraments* of *Confirmation* and *Extreme Unction.* This Patriarch is the ſame which is commonly call'd the Patriarch of *Babylon*; whoſe Reſidence is at *Mozal*, but called of *Babylon*, becauſe *Seleucia*, after the Deſolation of the true *Babylon* had the Name given to it (as it were eaſie to prove, if it were pertinent to this Deſign) and upon the Deſtruction of *Seleucia* the Patriarch remov'd firſt to *Bagdad*, and then to *Mozal*; whoſe Juriſdiction extends over all thoſe *Eaſtern* Chriſtians, which are called *Neſtorian.*

Cotov. *Itin. Hieroſol. & Syr. p.* 206.

In the *Abyſſine* Churches, *Godignus* ſaith poſitively from thoſe who had been converſant among them, That they knew nothing of the *Sacraments* of *Chriſm* and *Extreme Unction*; and that all the Confeſſion they have is general and rare; and that they have no Biſhops under the *Abuna*, and believe the Bond of *Matrimony* eaſily diſſolved. So that the *Tradition* of *Seven Sacraments* is wholly unknown to them; but as it was impoſed by the *Roman Miſſionaries*; which Impoſition was ſo ill receiv'd there, and brought ſuch Confuſion and Diſorders among them, that they are for ever baniſh'd.

Codign. *de rebus Abaſſin. l.* 1. *c.* 35. *c.* 36.

In the *Armenian* Churches, *Joh. Chernacenſis*, a *Latinized Armenian* ſaith, *that the* Armenians *owned not the* Seven Sacraments, *that they knew nothing of* Chriſm *and* Extreme Unction. Here we ſee a general Conſent as to the total Ignorance of two of the *Seven Sacraments* in theſe Churches. But *Clemens Galanus*, who had been many Years a *Miſſionary* among the *Armenians*, endeavours to prove that they had the *Tradition* of the *Seven Sacraments*; but very unſucceſsfully. For he produces none of their ancient Authors for it: but he names *Vartanus*, whom he ſets himſelf to confute afterwards; and he confeſſes, *that he took away the* Sacrament *of* Penance, *and made Burial of the Dead to be one of his Seven.* But more than that, he ſaith, *The* Armenian *Churches have forbidden* Extreme Unction, *as the* Neſtorians *had done Auricular Confeſſion.* So that nothing like a truly Catholick Tradition can be produced for the Number of *Seven Sacraments* either in the Church of *Rome* or elſewhere, within *Bellarmine*'s own term of 500 Years.

Clem. Galan. *Conc. Eccleſ.* Arm. *cum* Rom. c. 30. *p.* 516. Clem. Galen. *To.* 3. *p.* 439. *p.* 636. *p.* 605.

I am now giving an Account when this Number of Seven Sacraments came into the Church, and on what Occaſions it was advanced to be a Point of Faith.

The firſt I can find who expreſly ſet down the Number of Seven Sacraments, was *Hugo de S. Victore*, who liv'd in the *twelfth Century*, not long before *Peter Lombard.* But that there was an *Innovation* made by him in this Matter, I ſhall make appear by comparing what he ſaith

Hugo de S. Vict. *de Offic. l.* 1. *c.* 12.

ſaith with what others had delivered who were ſhort of the Primitive Fathers.

Rup. Tuit. *de Vict. Verbi l.* 12. c. 11. *Rupertus Tuitienſis* lived much about the ſame time in *Germany* that *Hugo* did at *Paris*, and he gives a different Reſolution of the Queſtion about the *Principal Sacraments*: For he names no more than *Baptiſm, the Euchariſt, and the double Gift of the Holy Ghoſt*; and, ſaith he, *theſe three Sacraments are neceſſary Inſtruments of our Salvation.* But *Hugo* ſaith, *there are ſeven principal Sacraments*; (which ſufficiently ſhews, that he thought there were other *Sacraments* beſides theſe; and ſo he expreſſes his mind in another place, where he makes all *ſymbolical Signs* to be *Sacraments*,) but the *principal Sacraments* he ſaith, *are thoſe which convey Grace.*

Hugo *de Sac. l.* 1. *part* 9. *c.* 6, 7.

Fulb. Carnot. *Epiſt.* 1. *Fulbertus Carnotenſis* lived in *France* in the beginning of the *tenth Century*; and where he diſcourſes of the *Sacraments* he names no more than *Baptiſm and the Euchariſt.* He calls the *Body and Blood two Sacraments*, and ſo did *Rabanus Maurus* before him.

*De Inſt. Cler. l.* 1. *c.* 31. Who lived in the ninth Age, and was a Perſon of great Reputation; and he names no more *Sacraments* than *Baptiſm* and *Chriſm*, and the *Euchariſt*; where he propoſes to treat of them; and had as juſt an Occaſion to have mention'd the reſt, as *Hugo* had. But *Bellarmine* ſaith, *he handled all wherein the Clergy were concerned, and therefore omitted none but Matrimony.* But were not they concerned to know whether it were a *Sacrament* or not? The Queſtion is not whether he mention'd the things, but whether he called them *Sacraments*; but I do not find *Extreme Unction* ſo much as mention'd by him in the place he refers us to.

Rab. Maur. *de Inſt. Cler. l.* 1. *c.* 24.

Bell. *de Sacr. l.* 2. *c.* 27.

Walaf. Strab. *de Reb. Eccl. c.* 16, 17, 26. In the ſame Age, *Walafridus Strabo*, where he purpoſely diſcourſeth of the *Sacraments*, names no more than *Rabanus Maurus*; and this had been an inexcuſable Omiſſion in ſuch who treat of *Eccleſiaſtical Offices*; and were to inform Perſons of their Duties about them. And therefore I lay much more weight on ſuch an Omiſſion in them than in any other Writers. I know *Paſchaſius Radbertus* mentions no more than *three Sacraments, Baptiſm, Chriſm* and the *Euchariſt*; but *Bellarmine* and *Sirmondus* ſay *he mention'd them for Example ſake*, becauſe it was not his buſineſs to handle the Number of *Sacraments*; but this Anſwer will by no means ſerve for thoſe who purpoſely treated of theſe matters; and therefore an Omiſſion in them is an Argument that they knew nothing of them.

Paſch. Radb. *de corp. & ſang. Dom. c.* 3.

Iſid. *Orig. l.* 6. *de Officiis.* And this Argument will go yet higher; for in the beginning of the *ſeventh Century*, *Iſidore* of *Sevil* treated of theſe matters, and he names no more than *Baptiſm, Chriſm* and the *Euchariſt*; and he tells us, *they are therefore called Sacraments, becauſe under the covering of corporeal things a ſecret and inviſible virtue is convey'd to the partakers of them.* And this very paſſage is entred into the *Canon Law c.* 1. *q.* 1. *c. Multi Secularium, &c.* and there it paſſes under the Name of *Gregory* I. but the *Roman Correctors* reſtore it to *Iſidore*.

Ivo *Decret.* 2. *p. c.* 73. But it may be objected, that *Ivo Carnotenſis* made a Collection of *Canons* before *Gratian*; who handles the *Sacraments* in his firſt and ſecond Part; and he ſeems to make the *annual Chriſm* to be a *Sacrament*; for which he quotes an Epiſtle of *Fabianus*, who ſaith it ought to be conſecrated every year, *quia novum Sacramentum eſt*; and this, he ſaith, *he had by Tradition from the Apoſtles.* Which Teſtimony the modern Schoolmen rely upon for a ſufficient Proof of this *Apoſtolical Tradition.* But this Epiſtle is a notorious Counterfeit, and rejected by all Men of

Yſamb. *ad q.* 72. *Diſp.* 1. *A.* 3.

any

any tolerable Ingenuity in the Church of *Rome*. Thus we trace the *Original* of ſome pretended *Apoſtolical Traditions* into that Maſs of *Forgeries*, the *Decretal Epiſtles*, which was ſent abroad under the Name of *Iſidore*.

*Ivo* produces another Teſtimony from *Innocentius* I. to prove *that Extreme Unction was then owned for a kind of Sacrament, and therefore ought not to be given to Penitents.* If this Rule holds, then either *Matrimony* was no *Sacrament*, or *Penitents* might not marry; but the *Canoniſts* ſay, even excommunicated Perſons may marry, but one of them ſaith, *It is a ſtrange Sacrament excommunicated Perſons are allow'd to partake of.* Ivo *ib. c.* 75.

But this *genus eſt Sacramenti* ſignifies very little to thoſe who know how largely the Word *Sacrament* was uſed in elder times, from *Tertullian* downwards. But our Queſtion is not about *a kind of a Sacrament*, but *ſtrict and proper Sacraments*; and if it had been then thought ſo, he would not have permitted any to adminiſter it; unleſs they will ſay it is as neceſſary to Salvation as *Baptiſm*, which none do. It appears from hence, that there was then a Cuſtom among ſome in regard to *S. James* his Words, if Perſons were ſick, to take ſome of the *Chriſm* to anoint them, and to pray over them in hopes of their Recovery; but this was no *Sacrament* of *dying Perſons*, as it is now in the Church of *Rome*. Alex. *Concil.*

If it had been then ſo eſteemed, S. *Ambroſe* (or whoever was the Author of the Book of *Sacraments*) would not have omitted it, and the other Supernumeraries, when he purpoſely treats of *Sacraments*; the ſame holds as to S. *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem*. And it is a poor Evaſion to ſay, *that they ſpake only to Catechumens*; for they were to be inſtructed in the Means and Inſtruments of Salvation, as they make all *Sacraments* to be.

And it is to as little Purpoſe to ſay, *that they do not declare there are but two*; for our buſineſs is to enquire for a *Catholick Tradition for ſeven true and proper Sacraments*, as the Council of *Trent* determines under an *Anathema*. But if we compare the Traditions for two and for ſeven together, the other will be found to have far greater Advantage; not only becauſe the two are mention'd in the eldeſt Writers, where the ſeven are not; but becauſe ſo many of the Fathers agree in the Tradition, *that the Sacraments were deſigned by the Water and Blood which came out of our Saviour's ſide.* So S. *Chryſoſtom*, S. *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, *Leo Magnus*, but above all S. *Auguſtin*, who ſeveral times inſiſts upon this; which ſhews that they thought thoſe two to be the *true and proper Sacraments* of Chriſtianity; however there might be other *Myſtical Rites* which in a large ſenſe might be called *Sacraments*.

*S.* Chryſ. *in* Joh. *hom.* 87.
*S.* Cyril. *in* Joh. *l.* 12.
Leo *in Epiſt. ad* Flavian.
*S.* Aug. *in* Joh. *Tr.* 9. 15.
*in* Pſ. 40.
*De Civit. Dei, l.* 15. *c.* 26.
*De Symbol. c.* 6.

As to the *Occaſions* of ſetting up this Number of *ſeven Sacraments*, they were theſe.

1. Some petty *Congruities* which they had found out for them. The *Number ſeven* they obſerve was in requeſt in the *Levitical Law*, as to *Sacrifices* and *Purifications*. *Naaman* was bid to waſh ſeven times. And *Bellarmine* in good earneſt concludes *that the whole Scripture ſeemed to foretel the ſeven Sacraments by thoſe things.* But beſides, he tells us of *the ſeven things relating to natural Life, which theſe have an Analogy with; the ſeven ſorts of Sins theſe are a remedy againſt, and the ſeven ſorts of Vertues which anſwer to the ſeven Sacraments.* But none of all theſe prove any *Catholick Tradition.* Bell. *de Sacr. l.* 2. *c.* 26.

2. Making no difference between *Myſtical Rites* continued in Imitation of Apoſtolical Practices. and *true and real Sacraments.* Impoſition of Hands for *Confirmation* and *Ordination* is allowed to be a very juſt and reaſonable Imitation of them; and as long as the *Miraculous Power* of *Healing* Diſeaſes continued, there was a fair Ground for continuing the Practice mentioned by S. *James*; but there was no Reaſon afterwards to change this into quite another thing, by making it a *Sacrament*, chiefly intended for doing away the Remainders of Sin.

3. Advancing the Honour of the Prieſthood; by making them ſo neceſſary for the actual Expiation of all ſorts of Sins, and in all Conditions. For no *Sacrament* is rightly adminiſtred, by the Council of *Trent*, without the *Prieſt*, and therefore clandeſtine *Marriages* are declared void by it. And it pronounces an *Anathema* againſt thoſe *who ſay any others than Prieſts can adminiſter Extreme Unction*; however it appears that in the time of *Innocentius* I. any might make uſe of the *Chriſm* when it was conſecrated by a Biſhop; but they are grown wiſer in the Church of *Rome* ſince that time; and as they have altered a Ceremony of *Curing* into a *Sacrament* of *Dying*, ſo they have taken Care that none but Prieſts ſhall perform that laſt Office, that the People may believe they can neither live nor die without them.

## VI. Of Auricular Confeſſion.

*Concil.* Trid. *Seſſ.* 14. *de Pœnit. c.* 5. The Council of *Trent* declares, *that the Univerſal Church always underſtood that Chriſt did inſtitute an entire Confeſſion of Sins; and that it is received by Divine Right to all who ſin after Baptiſm, becauſe our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, before his Aſcenſion into Heaven, did leave Prieſts as his Vicars, to be Preſidents and Judges, to whom all mortal Sins were to be made known, and of which they were, by the Power of the Keys, to give Sentence, ſo as either to remit or retain them.*

*Ib.* It farther ſaith, *That the moſt holy and ancient Fathers by a great and unanimous Conſent, did uſe this ſecret Sacramental Confeſſion from the beginning.*

And it denounces *Anathema's*,

*Can.* 1. 1. *Againſt him that denies the Sacrament of Penance to be of Chriſt's Inſtitution.*

3. 2. *Againſt him that denies that our Saviour's words, Receive ye the Holy Ghoſt, Whoſe Sins ye remit they are remitted, &c. are to be underſtood of the power of remitting and retaining in the Sacrament of* Penance, *as the Catholick Church always underſtood them.*

4, 6, 7. 3. *Againſt him that denies Confeſſion to be a part of it, or to have Divine Inſtitution, and to be neceſſary to Salvation; as it relates to all mortal, though ſecret Sins.*

Thus we ſee the Senſe of the *Council* of *Trent* in this matter; and I ſhall now make it evident there was no ſuch *Catholick Tradition*, as is here pretended for it, by the Confeſſion of their own Writers.

1. As to the General Senſe of the Church.

2. As to the founding it on *John* 22. *Whoſe Sins ye remit*, &c.

Maldonat. *de Sacr. Pœnit. De Confeſſ. c.* 2. 1. As to the General Senſe of the Church, *Maldonat* reckons up Seven ſeveral Opinions among themſelves about *Confeſſion.* 1. *Of thoſe who denied it to be of Divine Right, but held it to be uſeful in the Church*; and for this he quotes *Rhenanus* and *Eraſmus.* 2. *Of thoſe who make it to be only of Eccleſiaſtical Inſtitution*; *and this*, ſaith he, *is the Opinion of all*

*all the Canoniſts.* 3. *Of thoſe who thought it came in by Apoſtolical Tradition*; of which he reckons *Theodore* Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*. 4. *Of ſome Divines who held it to be inſtituted only by St.* James. 5. *Of others who held it to be of Divine Right, and not inſtituted by the Apoſtles, but inſinuated by Chriſt*; and for this he quotes *Alexander Hales*, and *Bonaventure*. 6. *Of ſome who thought it inſtituted in the Old Teſtament.* 7. *Of thoſe who held it inſtituted by Chriſt, but not as a Precept, but by way of Council*; and for this he mentions *Scotus* and his Followers.

*Vaſquez* reckons up among thoſe whoſe Opinions are not condemned, The *Canoniſts*, *Eraſmus*, *Bonaventure*, *Alexander Hales*, and *Scotus*, who all differed from the Council of *Trent*. Vaſquez *in* 3. Th. *To.* 4. *Q.* 90. *art.* 1. *n.* 4.

*Suarez* mentions three Opinions among them. 1. *Of thoſe who ſaid it was inſtituted in the Law of Nature.* 2. *Of thoſe who attributed it to the Law of* Moſes. 3. *Of thoſe who denied any Inſtitution of it by way of Precept from Chriſt in the Law of Grace*; and for this he quotes *Hugo de Sancto Victore*, *Alexander Hales*, and *Bonaventure*, and they went upon this Ground, *that no ſuch Inſtitution could be proved either by Scripture or Tradition.* Suarez. *in* 3. *p.* Th. *To.* 4. *Diſp.* 35. *Se.* 1.

*Gregory de Valentia* confeſſes, *ſome Catholick Authors denied the Divine Inſtitution of Confeſſion*; for which he produces the *Canoniſts*, and *Eraſmus* and *Rhenanus*. But he thinks *they were not guilty of Hereſie, becauſe they were not obſtinate*; but that is not our buſineſs, which is to ſhew, that by their own Confeſſion, there was not a conſtant *Catholick Tradition* in the Church about it. Greg. de Valent. *To.* 4. *Diſp.* 7. *Q.* 9. *Punct.* 2.

*Natalis Alexander*, who hath lately pretended to anſwer *Daillè*, confeſſes, *that from the ninth to the thirteenth Age, many Catholicks did hold, that Confeſſion to God alone was ſufficient to obtain Remiſſion of Sins*; and he proves it from *Lombard*, *Gratian* and the *Canoniſts*. But he ſaith *it was no hereſie in them, the point not being yet ſettled by a general Council.* Nat. Alex. *de Sacr. Confeſſ. p.* 229.

*Boileau*, in his Anſwer to *Daillè*, cannot deny *that in the time of* Lombard *and* Gratian *men held ſeveral ways about this matter*; but he anſwers with *Thomas* upon the *Sentences*, that *it was an Opinion then, but ſince the Council of* Lateran *it is become a Hereſie.* But if it were no heretical Opinion then, what becomes of *Infallible Tradition?* If the Church defines by *Tradition*, that *Tradition* muſt be proved before the *Definition*, otherwiſe it hath no ground to proceed upon. *Hiſt. Confeſſ. Auric. c.* 29.

The Council of *Lateran* under *Innocent* III. (it ſeems) made it *a Hereſie* to deny this *Sacramental Confeſſion.* Within much leſs than a Century before it, lived *Peter Lombard* and *Gratian*. *Peter Lombard* made it his buſineſs to collect a Body of Divinity out of the *Sentences* of the *Fathers*; and his Work hath been univerſally eſteemed in the *Roman Church*. When he comes to ſtate this Point of *Confeſſion* out of the *Fathers*, *i. e.* to give an account of the *Tradition* of the Church about it; he tells us in the beginning, *that learned Men were of different Opinions*; and for what Reaſon? *becauſe the Doctors of the Church ſeemed to deliver not only divers but contrary things*, *i. e.* they had no certain and conſtant *Tradition* about them. And when he comes to the Point of *Confeſſion to God only*, he quotes for it, beſides *Scripture*, S. *Ambroſe*, and S. *Chryſoſtom*, and *Proſper*; and againſt it S. *Auguſtin* and *Leo*, and concludes himſelf for the latter; but ſaith not a word more to ſhew that the conſtant *Tradition* of the Church had been for this Opinion. Lomb. *ſent. l.* 4. *Diſt.* 17.

*Gratian* puts the ſame Queſtion, and for *Confeſſion to God alone* he quotes S. *Ambroſe*, S. *Auguſtin*, and *Proſper*, beſides *Scripture*, and ar- Grat. *de Pœnit. Diſt.* 1.

gues largely for it after *c. convertimini, &c.* Then he ſets down the Arguments on the other ſide from *c.* 38. and after *c.* 60. he ſums up the force of them, and again after *c.* 87. and when he hath ſaid all on one ſide and on the other, he concludes after *c.* 89. *that he left all to the Readers Judgment; for both Opinions had wiſe and pious Defenders*; and produces that Saying as out of *Theodore*'s *Penitential*; *that ſome think that we ought to confeſs only to God, as the* Greeks, *others that we ought to do it to the Prieſt too, as almoſt all the Churches beſides*; but then he adds, *that Confeſſion to God purges away Sin, but that to the Prieſt ſhews how they are purged*, i. e. *by Contrition.* So the *Gloſs interprets it.* Bellarmine thinks that, *ut Græci*, was foiſted into the Canon, and I ſhall not diſpute againſt it, provided that which anſwers to it, *ut tota ferè ſancta Eccleſia*, be allowed to be ſo too, as the *Roman* Correctors do confeſs.

Bell. *de pœnit. l.* 3. *c.* 5.

*Hiſt. Confeſſ. Auric. p.*388. *Boileau* hath taken another courſe, for he ſaith, *this whole Diſtinction is without ground attributed to* Gratian; but how does he prove it? From *Ant. Auguſtinus* his *Dialogue*, where a MS. is cited that this was not *Gratian*'s, but an elder Author's. And what is gotten by this? But the other anſwers, *it muſt be* Gratian's, *becauſe of the Citation out of the Digeſts, and other Books of Civil Law then lately found.* If this will not do, he ſaith, Gratian *hath many Errors, as the Roman Correctors obſerve.* Yes truly do they; and about this Point ſeveral times; for the Councils of *Lateran* and *Trent* have otherwiſe determined. But what is all this to the *Tradition* of the Church in *Gratian*'s time?

*Innocent* III. in the Council of *Lateran*, enjoins ſtrictly the *Practice of Confeſſion once a year, under the Penalty of Excommunication, and of being deprived of Chriſtian Burial*; but there is not a Word of the Churches Tradition before, for the ground of it. But finding ſeveral Opinions about it, and the *Waldenſes* then oppoſing it, he reſolves by his *Authority* to bind all Perſons to it. But after this the *Canoniſts* allowed no more than *Eccleſiaſtical Inſtitution* for it; as is plain by the *Gloſs* on the *Canon Law*, *Diſt.* 5. *de Pœnit. Tit. in Penitentia*; but the *Roman Correctors* quote againſt it, *Concil. Trident, Seſſ.* 14. *c.* 5. *i.e.* a Council ſome 100 years after, muſt tell what the *Tradition* then was; but the *Gloſs* ſaith, *the Greeks had no ſuch Tradition, and therefore were not bound to Confeſſion.* So that we have no Evidence for any *Catholick Tradition* in this matter, before the *Lateran Council.*

2. But the *Council* of *Trent* hath gone beyond the *Council* of *Lateran*, and hath fixed the Divine Right of *Confeſſion* on *John* 20. *Whoſe Sins ye remit*, &c. and therefore I am now to ſhew, by the *Confeſſion* of their own Writers, that this hath not been the *Traditionary Senſe* of this Place.

*Cajetan*, not long before the *Council* firſt ſat, in his Notes on this place confeſſes, *that no Precept of Sacramental Confeſſion is contained in it.* But how ſhould it be of *Divine Right* in the Senſe of the Council of *Trent*, if there be no Command for it? *Yes, by Conſequence, if they will obtain Remiſſion of Sins*; but this can by no means be inferred from hence, becauſe the Remiſſion of Sins by *Baptiſm* is implied in it; but none of them plead for particular *Confeſſion* before *Baptiſm*, in order to *Remiſſion*; and therefore not after, unleſs ſome Command of Chriſt made it more neceſſary after *Baptiſm* than before. *Vaſquez* ſaith, *that* Cajetan *means no more, than that it cannot be proved out of this place*; but *Catharinus* ſaith, *that neither there nor in any other place doth* Cajetan *allow, that Auricular Confeſſion can be proved out of Scripture.*

Vaſquez *ubi ſupr.* Catharin. *in* Cajet. *p.*446.

*Gabriel*

*Gabriel Biel* confeſſes *he cannot find ſufficient force to conclude the Neceſſity of Confeſſion from the Power of Abſolution here granted; becauſe it may be valid upon voluntary Confeſſion of the Party; and therefore he reſolves it into an unwritten Tradition.* Biel *in* 4. *ſent. Diſt.* 17. *q.* 1. *a.* 1.

*Guido Brianſon* takes great pains to prove it out of this place, but at laſt yields, *that Chriſt's inſtituting ſuch a Power, doth not bind Perſons to confeſs their Faults to them that have it. For the Power of retaining doth not imply that no Sins are retained which are not retained by the Prieſt upon Confeſſion; neither then doth the Power of Abſolution imply that no Sins are remitted but ſuch as are confeſſed to a Prieſt.* And therefore he betakes himſelf, as *Biel* doth, to *unwritten Tradition*: and ſo doth *Nicol. de Orbelles* Brianſon *q.* 8. *Doc.* 1. *f.* 138. De Orbellis *ad l.* 4. *Diſt.* 17.

*Jac. de Almain* debates the matter at large; and he ſays only *that it is a probable Opinion, that this Confeſſion is of Divine Appointment*; but he yields, *that Chriſt's granting a Power of Abſolution, doth not make it a Duty to confeſs to a Prieſt*; and he ſaith, *it is a falſe Propoſition, that where a Power of judging is given, others are bound to ſubmit to it; for all that follows is, that their Sentence is valid if they do ſubmit.* Almain *in* 4. *Diſt.* 17.

But the force of what the Council of *Trent* declares from this place, lies wholly in this, as *Vaſquez* obſerves, *that becauſe Chriſt hath given Authority to abſolve, and they cannot exerciſe that Authority without Confeſſion, therefore Confeſſion is hereby made neceſſary.* And he confeſſes, *that ſcarce any have deduced the Argument effectually* from this place. But he ſaith one thing very obſervable, *that if this place be extended to Remiſſion of Sins in Baptiſm, then it can never prove the neceſſity of Sacramental Confeſſion.* And *Greg. de Valentia* as plainly owns, *that the Fathers aid underſtand it of Baptiſm*; he names S. *Cyprian*, and S. *Ambroſe*; but *Natalis Alexander* allows S *Cyril* of *Alexandria* to have ſo underſtood it; and that *Janſenius* and *Ferus* followed him; but beſides theſe S. *Auguſtin* interprets this place as S. *Cyprian* had done. For as S. *Cyprian* from hence infers *the Power of Baptizing and granting Remiſſion of Sins in the Guides of the Church*; ſo S. *Auguſtin* ſaith, *the Churches Charity by the Holy Ghoſt looſes the Sins of thoſe who are her Members, and retains the Sins of thoſe who are not.* And it may be obſerved, that whereas S. *Matthew* ſpeaks of the Power of *Baptizing* granted to the *Apoſtles*; S. *John* inſtead of that mentions this *Power* of remitting or retaining *Sins*, and S. *Mark* and S. *Luke* ſpeak of *Baptiſm*; to which the one joins *Salvation*, and the other *Remiſſion of Sins.* And therefore this ſeems to be meant by our Saviour in the Words of S. *John*; and thus S. *Peter* exerciſed this *Power of looſing* on the *converted Jews*, Act. 2. 38. and his *Power* of *binding* on *Simon Magus*, Act. 8. 21. Vaſquez *ib. dub.* 2. Greg. de Valent. *de Neceſſit. Confeſſ. c.* 3. Nat. Alex. *de Sacr. Confeſſ. p.* 22. Cyprian *ad* Jub. *Ep.* 73. Aug. *in* Joh. *Tr.* 121. S. Mark 16. 16. S. Luke 24. 47.

*Peter Lombard* carries S. *Auguſtin*'s meaning farther, to the Power of Prieſts over the Sins of the Members of the Church; but then he limits this Power, and makes it no more than *declarative*; as I have obſerved already; and for this he quotes a notable paſſage of S. *Jerom*, who ſaith, that *Men are apt to aſſume too much to themſelves under pretence of this Power of the Keys, whereas God regards not the Sentence of the Prieſts but the Life of the Penitents.* Per. Lomb. *l.* 4. *Diſt.* 18. Hieron. *in* Matth. *c.* 16.

But *Natalis Alexander* thinks *there is no binding Power with reſpect to Baptiſm*; Was there not as to *Simon Magus?* And as long as every year the Church judged of the *competency* of Perſons for it? When Chriſt ſpake theſe words the Church was wholly to be formed, and it was a great Power lodged with the *Apoſtles* and their *Succeſſors* to admit into the Church, or to exclude from it, not as private Perſons, but by Authority

thority from Christ himself. *But then this Power is vain and idle in a constituted Church.* By no means; they have still a *Power* of casting out and taking in again; and of imposing such Acts on Offenders, as may give satisfaction to the Church, whose Honour suffers, and whose Discipline is broken. But the question is, Whether by Christ's appointment under the Gospel no known mortal Sin can be pardon'd to *baptised Persons* without *Confession* of it to a Priest? And whether these words of our Saviour do imply it?

Scot. *in l.* 4. *Dist.* 17. *q. unica.* *Scotus* is by no means satisfied with Mens reasoning out of this place *that because Christ hath given such a Power, therefore it is Mens Duty to confess their Sins*; For, saith he, *this only implies the usefulness and efficacy of this Power if it be made use of*; as in *Confirmation, none think themselves damned if they do not use it, though it be very useful*; and therefore he goes another way to work, *viz. by joining this Precept and that of loving God and our selves together with it.* But how doth this prove that a Man ought to take this particular way? Truly, *Scotus* here shews his Subtilty. *Suppose there be another way that is harder, and that be found more easie, he thinks a Man is bound to take the shortest and easiest way,* viz. *by Confession and Absolution.*

But for all this his Heart did misgive him, and he could not but see, that this proved nothing, unless this way of *Confession* were first proved to be a secure way. And therefore he puts the Case, *that if it be not proved by these Words, it may be by S.* James, *Confess your faults one to another. No,* saith he, *this will not do*; for which he gives this Reason, *that it holds no more for Confession to a Priest than to any other*; therefore, after all, he is willing to resolve it into some *unwritten Tradition*, since there was no convincing Evidence for it, either in this or any other place of *Scripture.* Which shew'd they ran to Tradition, when they had nothing else to say.

Bonav. *in* 4. *Dist.* 17. 5. 3. *Bonaventure* denies that *Christ himself appointed the Confession of Sins*; for which he gives this Reason, *lest it should prove an occasion of sinning*; *ne ex verbis Domini daretur aliquibus recidivandi occasio*; but afterwards he thinks *the Apostles appointed it, and S.* James *published it*; which *Scotus* utterly denies. But to the place of S. *John, Bonaventure* saith *it was not enough to have it implied in the Priest's Power, because it being a harder Duty than Absolution, it requir'd a more particular Command.* Which was but reasonably said; especially when *Bellarmine* after others, urges, *that it is one of the most grievous and burthensome Precepts*; but his Inference from it is very mean, *that therefore it must have a divine Command to enforce it on the People*; but *Bonaventure's* Argument is much stronger, that it ought then to have been clearly expressed. But as to the People's yielding to it, other accounts are to be given of that afterwards.

Bell. *de Pœn. l.* 2. *c.* 12.

Alex. *Sum.* 3. *p. q.* 18. *num.* 3. *art.* 2. *Alexander Hales* observes, *that if Christ had intended a Command of Confession,* Joh. 20. *it would have been expressed to those who are to confess. and not to those who are to absolve; as he did to those who were to be baptised,* John 3. Except a man be born of water, *&c. so Christ would have said, except a man confess his Sins,* &c. *and he gave the same Reasons why Christ did not himself institute it, which* Bonaventure *doth,* who used his very Words.

And now who could have imagined that the Council of *Trent* would have attempted to have made Men believe *that it was the Sense of the Universal Church that Christ instituted Confession in* John 20? When so many great *Divines* even of the *Church* of *Rome* so expressly denied it; as I have made appear from themselves.

But

But now to give an account by what *Steps* and *Degrees* and on what *Occasions* this *Auricular Confession* came into the Church, these things are to be considered;

1. In the first Ages, *publick scandalous Offenders*, after *Baptism*, were by the *Discipline* of the Church brought to *publick Penance*; which was called *Exomologesis*; which originally signifies *Confession*. And by this, *Bellarmine* saith, *the Ancients understood either Confession alone, or joined with the other parts of Penance*; but *Albaspineus* shews, *that it was either taken for the whole course of publick Penance, or for the last or solemn Act of it, when the Bishop led the Penitents from the Entrance of the Church up to the Body of the Congregation, where they expressed their abhorrence of their Faults in the most penitent manner, by their Actions as well as by Words.* So that this was a real and publick *Declaration* of their Sorrow for their Sins, and not a *Verbal* or *Auricular Confession* of them. The same is owned by *La Cerda*. But *Boileau* pretends, *That it had not this Sense till after the Novatian Heresie and the Death of* Irenæus; *and that before that time it signified Confession according to the Sense of the Word in Scripture.* This seems very strange, when *Baronius* himself confesses, *that* Tertullian *uses it for that part of Penance which is called Satisfaction*; and *Bellarmine* grants it is so used both by *Tertullian* and *Irenæus*; when he saith *the Woman seduced by* Marcus, *afterwards spent her days in Exomologesi.* What! in continual *Confession* of her Sin? No, but in *Penitential Acts* for it; and so *Petavius* understands it, both in *Irenæus* and *Tertullian*; and he saith, *it did not consist only or principally in Words but in Actions, i. e.* It was nothing of Kin to *Auricular Confession*, which is a part of *Penance* distinct from *Satisfaction*. And to make these the same, were to confound the Parts of the *Sacrament* of *Penance*, as the Council of *Trent* doth distinguish them.

Bell. *de Pœn. l.* 3. *c.* 6.

Albasp. *Obs. l.* 2. *c.* 26.

La Cerda *Adverss. Sacr. c.* 142. *p.* 2. *Hist. Confess. Auric. c.* 4. *p.* 72.

Baron. *ad A. D.* 56.

Iren. *l.* 1. *c.* 9.

Petav. *Not. ad* Epiphan. *p.* 71.

*De la Pœnit publique l.* 2 *ch.* 13. *n.* 9.

But besides this, there were several other *Circumstances*, which do make an apparent difference between these *Penitential Acts* and the modern Notion of *Confession*.

1. The *Reason* of them was different. For, as *Rigaltius* observes, *the penitential Rigour was taken up after great Numbers were admitted into the Church*; and a great Dishonour was brought upon Christianity by the Looseness or Inconstancy of those who professed it. There were such in S. *Paul*'s time in the Churches of *Corinth*, and elsewhere; but although he gives Rules about such, yet he mentions no other than *avoiding* or *excommunicating the guilty Persons*, and upon due Sorrow and Repentance receiving them in again; but he imposes no necessity of *Publick* or *Private Confession* in order to *Remission*. much less of every kind of mortal Sin, though it be but the breach of the tenth Commandment, as the *Council* of *Trent* doth; yet this had been necessary in case he had thought, as that declares, *that God will not forgive upon other terms.* And so much the rather, because the *Evangelists* had said nothing of it; and now Churches begin to fill, it was absolutely necessary for him to have declared it, if it were a necessary Condition of Pardon for Sins after Baptism. But although the *Apostles* had given no Rules about it, yet the *Christian Church* suffering so extremely by the Reproaches cast upon them, they resolved, as far as it was possible, to take care to prevent any *scandalous Offences* among them. To this end, the Actions of all Persons who professed themselves Christians were narrowly watched; and their Faults, especially such as were *scandalous*, complained of; and then if they confessed them, or they were

Bigalt. *not. in* Tert. *de Pœn.*

were convicted of them, a severe and rigorous Discipline was to be undergone by them before they were restored to Communion; that their Enemies might see how far the Christians were from encouraging such *Enormities* as they were accused of. They were charged with *Thyestian Suppers* and *promiscuous mixtures*; whereas, any Persons among them who were guilty of *Homicide* or *Adultery*, were discharged their Society, and for a great while not admitted upon any Terms; and afterwards, upon very rigorous and severe Terms. And besides these, to preserve the Purity of their Religion in times of Persecution, they allowed no *Compliance* with the *Gentile Idolatry*; and any tendency to this, was looked upon as a degree of Apostacy, and censured accordingly. And about these three sorts of Sins, the severity of the Primitive Discipline was chiefly exercised; which shews, that it proceeded upon quite different grounds from those of the Council of *Trent* about *Auricular Confession*.

2. The *Method* of *proceeding* was very different; for here was no *toties quoties* allow'd; that Men may sin, and confess, and be absolved; and then sin the same Sin again, and receive Absolution in the same manner. The *Primitive Church* knew nothing of this way of dealing with Sinners upon *Confession*. If they were admitted *once* to it that was all. So *Pamelius* himself grants, and produces several Testimonies of *Fathers* for it; and so doth *Albaspineus* and *Petavius*. Dare any say this is the Sense of the Church of *Rome* about *Confession*, that a Man cannot be received a second time to *Confess* and be absolved from the same Sin? How then can they pretend any *Similitude* between their *Confession* and the ancient *Exomologesis*? Besides, none ever received *Absolution* from the Ancient Church till full *Satisfaction* performed. But in the Church of *Rome*, *Absolution* is given before *Satisfaction*; and although some have complained of this, as a great Abuse; yet they have been sharply answer'd, *that it is to call in question the Conduct of the Church for five hundred years; and they may as well question many other things, whith depend upon the Authority of the present Church.*

Pamel. *not.* 1. *in* Terr. *de Pœnit.*
Albasp. *Obs. l.* 2, *c.* 5.
Petav. *ad* Epiph. *p.* 236.
*Append. ad* Epiph. *c.* 3. *p.* 91.

3. The *Obligation* to Confession is very different from what it was in the ancient *Evangelists*. Now by the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, a Person looks on himself as bound in Conscience to confess *every mortal Sin*; but in the *Ancient Church* none can imagine that Persons were bound to undergo the *Exomologesis* for every mortal Sin, there being no *Penitential Canons* which did ever require it; but they had respect to some particular Sins, and the *Penance* was proportion'd to them.

We ought to take notice of two Things with respect to the *Discipline* of the *Ancient Church*, which will shew the different Notion it had of these things, from what is now current in the Church of *Rome*.

1. That it did not exclude those from all hopes of *Salvation*, whom it excluded from *Penance*; as may be seen in the *Illiberitan Council*, where many are wholly shut out from the *Church*, whom we cannot think they thought uncapable of Salvation. From whence it follows, that they did not look on *Confession* and *Absolution* as a necessary Condition of Salvation; but now in the Church of *Rome* they allow Confession to all, because they think they cannot otherwise be in a state of Salvation in an ordinary way. But in the *Ancient Church* they could not look on the *desire* of *Confession* as necessary, for to what purpose should they make that necessary when they desired the thing? But in

Conc. Illiber. &c. 1, 2, 3, 9

he

the Church of *Rome*, they make the *Deſire* neceſſary, becauſe they hold the Thing it ſelf to be ſo, if there be Means to have it

2. That the *Penitential Canons* never extended, in the *Primitive Church*, to all thoſe Sins which the *Church* of *Rome* now accounts *Mortal*, and therefore neceſſary to be confeſſed. The Council of *Trent* ſaith expreſly, they muſt confeſs *omnia & ſingula peccata mortalia —— etiam occulta* ——and an *Anathema* is denounced againſt him that denies it to be neceſſary to Remiſſion of them. Now if we conſider their Notion of *mortal Sins*, we ſhall eaſily diſcern the vaſt difference between the Obligation to Confeſſion by the Council of *Trent*, and by the old *Penitential Canons*. For *mortal* Sins are not only all voluntary Acts committed againſt the known Laws of God, but againſt the Laws of the Church; and even venial Sins may become mortal by the Diſpoſition of the Perſon, and by other Circumſtances, which the Caſuiſts ſet down at large. Now the Council of *Trent* doth expreſly oblige Men, not only to relate the Acts themſelves, but *all Circumſtances which change the kind of Sin*. And this is racking the Conſciences of Men far beyond whatever we find in the old *Penitential Canons*; for, *Petavius* confeſſes *that that many Sins now accounted mortal, had no Penance appointed for them by the old Canons*; and therefore I need not take any pains to prove it: If any one hath a mind to be ſatisfied, he may ſee it in *Gregory Nyſſen*'s *Canonical Epiſtle*, where he owns that ſeveral of thoſe Sins, for which the *Scripture* excludes from the Kingdom of Heaven, have no *Canonical Penance* preſcribed them by *the ancient Canons of the Church*. Which ſhews a mighty difference from the Rule of the *Council* of *Trent*.

*De Pœnit. can.* 7.

Petav. *not. ad* Epiph. *p.* 238.

Greg. Nyſſ. *Epiſt. ad* Let. *c.* 4, 5.

The moſt plauſible place in Antiquity brought for all *mortal Sin*, is that of S. *Cyprian*, where he ſaith, *that ſome confeſſed their very Thoughts, though they had not proceeded to actual Sin*. It is true, that he doth ſpeak of ſome ſuch; but was it for *Sins* of *Thought* againſt the *tenth Command*? No; but it is very plain, that he ſpeaks of that Sin which was thought to imply a renouncing Chriſtianity, and S. *Cyprian* elſewhere calls *ſummum delictum*, and *the Sin againſt the Holy Ghoſt*; *viz.* conſenting to any *Act* of *Gentile Idolatry*; and yet S. *Cyprian* had much ado to perſuade thoſe who were actually guilty to ſubmit to due Penance for it; but they obtained *Tickets* from the *Confeſſors*, and were admitted to Communion without undergoing the Diſcipline of the Church, the Conſequence whereof would be, that the Diſcipline would be loſt, and the Church over-run with Apoſtates; this makes S. *Cyprian* plead hard againſt ſuch practices, and among other Arguments he uſes this of the great Tenderneſs of ſome, who, becauſe they had entertained ſuch Thoughts of doing as others did, for their own Safety, they offer'd to unburthen their Conſciences before them, and deſired Remedy for ſmall Wounds; how much more ought they to confeſs their Faults whoſe Wounds are greater? This is the whole Force of his Reaſoning; where the Thought and Act relate to the ſame Sin; and that ſaid to be no leſs than *denying Chriſt, and ſinning againſt the Holy Ghoſt*. But there is no parity in the Caſe of other Sins; which even S. *Cyprian* calls *minora delicta*, being againſt Men immediately; and there is no Intimation in him that ever the Thoughts of thoſe Sins were diſcovered, or that Perſons were under any Obligation by the Rules of the Church to do it.

Cypr. *de lapſis, n.* 23.

Cypr. *Ep.* 10.

Cypr. *Ep.* 11.

2. *Private Offenders* were ſometimes adviſed, in thoſe firſt Ages, for the Eaſe of their *Conſciences* to make *Confeſſion*, of their Sins; of which

we see an Instance, as to the Practice, in one Case in S. *Cyprian*'s time. And *Tertullian* compares such Persons who avoid it, to those who have such secret Ulcers that they chuse *rather to perish than to discover them*: Now in Cases of this Nature he advises to *Confession, and publick penitential Acts*, that so they may in the Judgment of the Church have the Wounds of their Consciences healed. And this is that which *Origen* doth advise to in such Cases, *to seek out a wise spiritual Physician, and to make known his inward Distemper to him, and to follow his Advice and Direction, as to the Method of Cure.* Now this we never oppose; but the only Question is, whether it be necessary for all Persons, and for every mortal Sin, to make *Confession* of it to the *Priest*, that it may be forgiven: and *Origen* never once supposes this; for he mentions several other ways for the *Remission of Sins* after *Baptism*, by *Martyrdom*, by *Alms*, by *forgiving and converting others*, by *great Love to God*, and in the last place he brings in this *of a Laborious Penance and Confession.* Either the former ways are sufficient without this, or not; if they are, then this is not necessary to the Remission of all mortal Sins; if not, to what purpose doth he mention so many ways, when this one is sufficient without them, and all those are insufficient without this? For *Boileau* confesses, *that no mortal Sins according to them can be remitted where there is not at least the desire of this.* But *Origen* shews the different ways of obtaining Remission, or else he doth not answer the difficulty; which was, *that the Jews had several sorts of Sacrifices for the Expiation of Sins, to which we have none answerable under the Gospel. Yes*, saith *Origen*, *Baptism answers to one sort, Martyrdom to another, Alms to a third*, &c. and last of all, *Penance to the Offering baked in the Frying-Pan.* From whence it is plain, that he looked on this as one particular way proper to some Cases, and not as a general Method for the Remission of all mortal Sins. But he urges, *that* Origen *quotes Scripture for the Confession of Sins, as necessary*, Hom. 2. *in* Psal. 37. But what *Scripture*? Even the Words of the *Psalmist*, *I will confess my Iniquity.* And was *Confession* to a Priest necessary under the Law? How then can those Words prove it necessary under the Gospel? Although therefore *Origen* might think it very convenient in some Cases for *Penitents* to unload their Consciences by Confession to a *Spiritual Physician*, yet we find no proof of any necessity of it, as to all mortal Sins. It is confessed, that publick Faults, either confessed or proved, had publick *Penance* appointed for them by the *Penitential Canons*; but *Boileau*, after *Arnauld*, pleads, *that even Secret Sins being mortal, were not thought remissible by the Keys of the Church, without publick Penance.* But this can never be proved to have been the Doctrine of the *Ancient Church*, and it is unreasonable to suppose; for then, all Persons must have undergone publick Penance who had any mortal Sin, and it must have been frequently born by the same Persons, both which are inconsistent with the *Ancient Discipline.* But they saw there was no other way to maintain the *Necessity* of *Confession*, but by this. For they could find none but *publick Penance*, and that by the *Penitential Canons* was prescribed only for some particular scandalous Sins; and therefore they fansied, that Persons who committed other faults, were bound to confess them privately, and to undergo publick Penance for them. I do not deny, but some *great Penitents*, for secret Faults, would of their own accord submit to the publick Discipline; but this was a voluntary Act in them, that by this means they might assure

Orig. *in* Levit. *Hom.* 2. *in* Psal. 37. *Hom.* 2. *in* Luc. *Hom.* 17.

*Hist. Confess. Auric. c.* 5. *n.* 8.

aſſure themſelves the more of the ſincerity of their own Repentance; and it being looked on as an Act of *Humility* and *Piety*, it made it go down the better with *Voluntary Penitents*.

3 For the ſake of ſuch *Voluntary Penitents* in great Churches, whoſe Caſes required *particular and private Examination and Direction*, there was a *Penitentiary* appointed, whoſe *Office* it was to receive their *Confeſſions*, and to direct and order the Method of their *Penance*. Of this we have a famous Inſtance in the Church of *Conſtantinople*, in the time of *Nectarius*, about which ſo much hath been taken for different purpoſes. That which ſeems moſt propable to me, is, that the *Penitentiary* was appointed to examin and judge of ſuch *Penetential Cauſes* which were brought before him, (not being notorious,) and to give ſentence according to the Canons; but eſpecially of *Voluntary Confeſſions* of Perſons, whoſe Conſciences were oppreſſed with the Guilt of Secret Sins; and to thoſe he was to appoint *Penance* without revealing their Faults. Where the Facts were *notorious* and *ſcandalous*, I ſuppoſe the ancient *Diſcipline* of the *Church* (part whereof is to be ſeen in the *Canonical Epiſtles*) to have ſtill continued at *Conſtantinople*, as well as in other Churches. But there were many private miſcarriages, wherein great Prudence and Judgment was required, both to determine the *Penance*, and to manage it ſo, that it did not break out into an open Scandal. And for Caſes of this Nature the *Penitentiary* was appointed; to whom all Perſons might reſort in private caſes, and open their Conſciences to him, and take his Directions how to perform their *Penitential Acts*. So it was with that Perſon of Quality at *Conſtantinople*, who gave occaſion to the aboliſhing the *Office* of *Penitentiary*, both there, and in all the *Eaſtern Churches*. She firſt went to the *Penitentiary*, as a *voluntary Penitent*, and confeſſed her Faults to him; and took his directions; and while ſhe was performing her Penance in the Church, the Fact was committed with the Deacon, which ſhe afterwards confeſſed to the *Penitentiary*. Who being enraged at the Deacon, in probability through his deſire to have him puniſhed, the Fact came to be diſcovered, and the People to be highly offended: And it is not reaſonable to ſuppoſe that the *Penitentiary* put her upon a *publick Confeſſion* of her ſecret fault; but that it came out by his means; and therefore *Nectarius* thought fit no longer to put ſuch a Truſt into any Man's hand, which through his diſcovery might redound to the Diſhonour of the Church, as that did. *Pandect. Canon. Vol. 2.*

What the Effect was of aboliſhing this Office, is the great Queſtion, whether the taking away *publick* or *private Confeſſion*. If the Hiſtorians may be believed, it was the *Neceſſity of making any Confeſſion at all in ſecret*; for the Right of receiving ſuch Confeſſions, was devolved upon the *Penitentiary*; therefore when his Office was put down, where the Caſe was not notorious, every one *muſt be left to his own Conſcience*; and that both *Socrates* and *Sozomen* affirm was the conſequence of it. If onely *publick Confeſſion* was taken away, as ſome imagine, a *ſecret Confeſſion* was ſtill continued, how was it poſſible for the *Hiſtorians* to miſtake the matter ſo groſly, by making that the conſequence of it? For, *is every man left to his own Conſcience*, where he is bound to go to *Confeſſion* before he partakes of the *Euchariſt*? And why ſhould publick *Penance* be taken away on this occaſion, where there ſeems to have been none; for that Perſon underwent no *publick* Penance upon her former *Confeſſion*, for then her *Penance* would not have been *done in the* *Socr. l. 5. c. 19. Soz. l. 7. c. 16.*

*Church*, but out of it, among the *Penitents*. But as the former was voluntary, so was the latter too; for here was no Accuser but her self; and for what Reason should publick and solemn Penance for notorious Crimes, be taken away for the sake of the discovery of a *Secret Confession*? Whether the punishment of the Deacon were the Occasion of its coming out, or whatever it was, it seems evident to me, that she was not obliged to any publick Confession; because *Sozomen* saith, *the Penitentiary was chosen for his Gravity, Silence and Wisdom*; but what *Silence* was there, if the *Confessions* were to be made *publick*? And on the other side, it is impossible to conceive, that if all Persons were then obliged to confess all mortal Sins after *Baptism*, that one *Penitentiary* should be sufficient in so vast a City as that of *Constantinople* was. Therefore I think it most probable, that the case of *notorious and scandalous Offenders* stood as it did, and so continued in S. *Chrysostom*'s time; but this Office of *Penitentiary* relating to *voluntary* and *secret Offenders* was taken away because a greater *Scandal* came to the Church by the discovery, when such a publick Disgrace made the Fact become notorious. And so this Act of *Nectarius*, in taking away the *Penitentiary*'s Office, and the *Approbation* of it by other Churches following the Example, evidently proves, that they did not look on *Confession* of *secret Sins*, as necessary to the *Remission* of them.

4 As the taking away the *Penitentiary*'s Office shewed the Sense of the *Church* at that time against the *Necessity of Confession* in order to Pardon, so it did likewise in order to the partaking of the Eucharist. For

Socr. *l.* 5. *c.* 19. *Socrates* saith, *that* Eudæmon *gave that Counsel to* Nectarius, *that he should remove the Penitentiary, and give every one leave to pass Judgment on himself in his own Conscience, and so to partake of the Mysteries.* The

Soz. *l.* 7. *c.* 16. same is affirmed by *Sozomen*. Which respects not the *publick Discipline* about *Notorious Offenders*, but the private Applications made by scrupulous persons and secret *Offenders* to the *Penitentiary* in order to a right preparation for the Eucharist. And it is very probable, that it was then believed by many, that they could not be duly fitted for that *Sacrament*, unless they had first unburthened their *Consciences* by a *voluntary Confession* to the *Penitentiary*, and followed his Directions. But this *Office* being taken away, the Question now is, whether it were thought necessary to *confess privately* to any other? The Council of

*Concil.* Trid. *Sess.* 13. *c.* 7. *Can.* 11. *Trent* declares, *that Sacramental Confession is necessary to a worthy partaking of the Eucharist, to every one that is conscious to himself of any mortal sin; and whosoever holds the contrary is declared excommunicate* ipso facto. But these Historians plainly deny it, and they are justified by S. *Chrysostom*, who speaks to the very Case; not about *Catechumens*, but such as would fit themselves for the *Holy Eucharist*. And he several times declares, that a man needs not reveal his to any but *to God alone*, in order to it. Nothing can be more Emphatical than what he saith to that purpose. For this Cause S. *Paul* saith. *Let a man examin himself, and so let him eat of that Bread, and drink of that Cup; he doth not lay open the secret Ulcer; he doth not bring the Accusation into a Theatre; he appoints no Witnesses of thy transgressions; pass judgment within in thy own Conscience, there examin thy faults, and call thy self to an account for the sins of thy Life, where none but God is present, who sees all things; amend thy faults, and so with a pure Conscience draw near to the holy Table, and partake of the Sacrifice there offered.*

Διὰ τοῦτο φησιν ὁ Παῦλος. Ἕκαστος δὲ δοκιμαζέτω ἑαυτὸν καὶ οὕτως ἐκ τῆς ἄρτης ἐσθιέτω καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ποτηρίου πινέτω· οὐκ ἀπεκάλυψε τὸ ἕλκος, οὐκ εἰς κοινὸν θέατρον ἤγαγε τὴν κατηγορίαν· ἐπετίμησε μάρτυρας μὴ πλημμελημάτων· ἔνδον ἐν τῇ συνειδότι, μηδενὸς παρόντος, πάλιν τὰ τὰ πάντα ὁρῶντος Θεοῦ, ποιῆ τὴν κρίσιν, καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτημάτων τὴν ἐξέτασιν καὶ πάντα τὸν βίον ἀναλογιζόμενος· οὕτω τοῦ νῦν τὸ κρεῖττον ἄγε τὰ ἁμαρτήματα, διόρθωσαι τὰ πλημμελήματα, καὶ ὕστερον μετὰ καθαρᾶς τῆς συνειδότος τὴν ἱερᾶς ἅπτου τραπέζης, καὶ τῆς ἁγίας μέτεχε θυσίας. S. Chrys. *To.* 6. *p.* 837. *Hom.* 8. *de Pœnit. Hom.* 28. *in* 1 *ad* Corinth.

But leſt this ſhould be thought one of thoſe ſudden eloquent heats which Petavius ſaith, *are hardly capable of good ſenſe, if too ſtrictly examined*; we find him very coolly delivering the ſame Doctrine in his Expoſition of thoſe words of S. *Paul*. Than which nothing can be more inconſiſtent with the *Doctrine* and *Practice* of the Church of *Rome*, which makes *Confeſſion* of our *Sins* to a Prieſt a neceſſary Preparation for the *Euchariſt*. *Catharinus* ſaith, *that if the Church had not limited the time, yet every Perſon would be bound to confeſs to a Prieſt, as often as he communicated. And although he knew no mortal ſin by himſelf, yet he would deſerve the ſevereſt Cenſure for not confeſſing, becauſe he took upon him to be his own Judge*. Can any thing be more contrary to S. *Chryſoſtom* than this? *Boileau* confeſſes, *that S.* Chryſoſtom *doth not here refer at all to Confeſſion to a Prieſt*; then it follows, that he thought it not neceſſary to right participation of the Holy Euchariſt. Here he ſpeaks not of *daily Examination* of *Conſcience by the Faithful*; but of the ſolemn Judgment of *Conſcience* by way of due Preparation; and ſo juſtifies the Fact of *Nectarius* in taking away the *Penitentiaries* Office. But we are not to ſuppoſe ſo great and ſo zealous a Man would have done it againſt his Conſcience, as he muſt, if he ſtill thought *Confeſſion to a Prieſt neceſſary*; and he doth not ſay, *they need not go now to the* Penitentiary, but that they need not diſcloſe their ſins to any. *Not to a multitude, nor in a theatrical manner*, as ſome expound it; but *to none but God*, which excludes the the knowledge of a ſingle Prieſt, as well as of a great number. I need not inſiſt on the other places in St. *Chryſoſtom* to that purpoſe, ſince theſe are ſufficient for my deſign.

Petav. *Not. ad* Epiphan. *p.* 224.

Cathar. & Cajetan *p.* 453. 451. *Hiſt. Confeſſ. Auric. p.* 201.

*Caſſian* was a Diſciple of S. *Chryſoſtom*, and he ſuppoſes *Confeſſion to God alone to be ſufficient for Remiſſion of Sin, where mere modeſty hinders men from confeſſing to men. Boileau* anſwers, *that he doth not ſpeak of Sacramental Confeſſion made to Prieſts; but of an Aſcetick Confeſſion among the Monks*. But he ſpeaks of a Confeſſion to God as ſufficient for Remiſſion of Sins, and therefore muſt exclude the *Neceſſity* of any other.

Caſſian. *Coll. lat.* 20. *c.* 8.

*Hiſt. Confeſſ. Auric. ic.* 18. *p.* 286.

5. After the taking away *the Penitentiary's Office*, the *publick Diſcipline* of the Church, as to *open* and *ſcandalous Offenders* continued for ſome time in the *Eaſtern* as well as the *Weſtern Churches*. No one ſpeaks more fully to this than S. *Chryſoſtom*; which makes me wonder at thoſe who ſay the *publick Penance* was taken away by *Nectarius*, for in his 82. *Homily* on S. *Matthew*, towards the Concluſion he inſiſts very much upon it; and not only charges the People not to come with their ſins upon them; but he ſpeaks to thoſe who miniſtred, *to deny the Euchariſt to open Offenders*. And he ſaith, *it would be charged as a great Fault upon them, if they knew ſuch and permitted them to communicate. But how ſhall we know them? I ſpeak not*, ſaith he, *of thoſe who are not, but of thoſe who are known; and if any ſuch did thruſt themſelves in, he bids them not be afraid to deny them; and if they durſt not*, he tells them, *they ſhould bring them to him, and he would rather loſe his life than give that Sacrament to ſuch unworthy receivers*. But ſtill he ſaith he ſpeaks of *open and notorious Offenders*. Which ſhews plainly, that even S. *Chryſoſtom* never thought the *publick Diſcipline* was changed; ſince he declares ſo much Reſolution to maintain it. And this could not be ſpoken by him while he was a *Presbyter* at *Antioch*, but after he came to the See of *Conſtantinople*. There was no doubt ſome alteration as to the *Penitents*, after the taking away the *Penitentiary*; but it was no more than his Office was concerned in. The old *Penitential Canons* remained ſtill in force and were executed, as *Occaſion*

were

ſerved; as appears by the *Canons* in *Trullo* ſo long after S. *Chryſoſtom*'s time which refer to them. If all the *publick Diſcipline* had been laid aſide ſo long before, to what purpoſe do thoſe *Biſhops* ſpeak of them, as if they were ſtill in force? See *Canon* 44, 46, 53, 54, 87. In the laſt *Canon* indeed *they leave it to thoſe who had the Power of binding and looſing to temper the ſeverity of the Canons as they ſhould judge convenient*; but doth it hence follow, that the ancient Diſcipline as to *publick Offenders* was deſtroy'd? S. *Chryſoſtom* himſelf ſeveral times mentions thoſe who were in the ſtate of *Penitents* and *the Prayer that was made for them*; to what purpoſe, in caſe the whole Order of *Penitents* was taken away? He likewiſe ſpeaks of the charge *for the Penitents to go out*. What a *mockery* were this, if there were no *publick Diſcipline* then left? And leſt it ſhould be ſaid, *that theſe things were ſaid by him at* Antioch, *before the fact of* Nectarius, I have ſhew'd already that the latter Homilies on S. *Matthew* were made by him at *Conſtantinople*; and in his *Liturgy* there uſed the diſmiſſion of the *Penitents* was continued.

S. Chryſ. *in* Matth. *Hom.* 71.
*In* 2. *Ep. ad* Cor. *Hom.* 18.
*Hom.* 3. *in Ep. ad* Epheſ.

6. While the *publick Diſcipline* was kept in the ſeveral Churches none were injoyned to undergo it, but *open and publick Offenders*. The Evidence being ſo clear in *Antiquity* for the *publick Penance* of thoſe who were bound to give the Church *ſatisfaction* before they receiv'd *Abſolution* from it; there was a neceſſity found by ſome learned Men of the *Roman Communion* to ſet up a new *Hypotheſis*, viz. *that by the Ancient Rules of the Church all Perſons conſcious to themſelves of ſecret ſins were bound to undergo publick Penance for the Remiſſion of their ſins.* The occaſion of the debate was this. Some in the Church of *Rome* held no more neceſſary in caſe of *mortal Sin* to prepare men for *Communion than Confeſſion to a Prieſt and Abſolution*; others ſaw the fatal Conſequence of this, and therefore inſiſted on the *Neceſſity of Penance*; both Parties made their Appeal to the *Ancient Church*; and both were miſtaken. For, on the one ſide, there was no ſuch Doctrine then held that *Confeſſion and Abſolution* did ſufficiently prepare Perſons for the *Euchariſt*; and on the other, there was no good Evidence that any were enjoyned *publick Penance* for ſecret faults. But in the Caſe of ſuch ſins, the Confeſſion was left to God in Secret; and a true and hearty Contrition for them was thought the beſt as well as moſt neceſſary Preparation for the Euchariſt.

Petav. *de la Penitence publique, l.* 5. *ch.* 10. *p.* 64.

Monſr. *Arnauld* ſaw well enough that without his *Hypotheſis*, it was impoſſible to prove the *Neceſſity* of *Confeſſion* in the *Antient Church*; for he yields that the Church did not uſe the Power of the *Keys* but *in Publick*. On the other hand, Petavius urges, *that on the ſame Ground that they would reduce, as they pretended, the Ancient Diſcipline they muſt make many other alterations in the Church, and ſo juſtifie the Reformers.* But Monſr. *Arnauld* was defective in his Proofs, as Petavius at large ſhews; not when he proves *that the Penance was publick*; but that all Perſons under mortal ſins were bound to undergo it. For Petavius makes it appear, that all ſuch as are accounted *mortal ſins* in the modern ſenſe, were not then thought neceſſary to be expiated by *publick Penance*; but only ſuch as were *notorious* and *ſcandalous*, and he at large anſwers all Monſr. *Arnauld*'s Arguments. Notwithſtanding which *Morinus* took up Monſr. *Arnauld*'s Opinion, and without any colour charges it on *Theodore* Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, 'that he firſt in his Penitential appointed publick Penance to be only for publick Offences. But the learned Editor of the *Abſtract* of *Theodore's Penitential*, hath hath fully vindicated him in this matter.

Arn. *de freq. Communione, Part.* 2. *c.* 3. *p.* 205.
Petav. *l.* 2, *c.* 5. *n.* 3.
*l.* 6. *c.* 2, *&c.*
Morin. *Com. de Pœnit. l.* 10. *c.* 17.
Theod. *Vind. p.* 61, *&c.*

But

But after theſe *Boileau* reſumes the Opinion of Monſr. *Arnauld*, and lays it for the Foundation of his Hiſtory of *Auricular Confeſſion.* But he grants, *that all the ſolemn and ceremonial Penance, impoſed by the Penitential Canons did not extend to all kind of mortal ſins, but chiefly to Idolatry, Adultery and Homicide*; but this he inſiſts upon, *that ſome part of this publick Penance*, viz. *Excluſion from the Communion, was inflicted on Perſons guilty of ſecret mortal ſins.* But this will by no means do his buſineſs; for he is to prove that *no ſecret mortal ſin could be forgiven without Confeſſion to a Prieſt*; and that all perſons were required by the ancient Church, in caſe they were conſcious to themſelves of any ſuch ſins, to make them known, and to undergo *publick Penance* for them, before they could obtain *Remiſſion* of them. We do not deny that Perſons under Trouble of Conſcience for ſecret ſins, were from time to time adviſed to reſort to their Guides, to make known their *Caſes* to them, and to take their *Directions*; we do not deny that ſuch Perſons might be required by ſuch *Guides* to withdraw themſelves from joining in the moſt ſolemn *Acts of publick Communion* till they had manifeſted the Sincerity of their Repentance, by *Faſting*, and *Prayers*, and other *Penitential Acts*; we do not deny, that ſome of theſe Perſons might either by Advice or of their own Accord join themſelves with the *publick Penitents*, as is well known in the Caſe of *Fabiola* at *Rome*, ſo much magnified by S. *Jerom*; but this is the thing we deſire to ſee proved, that no ſin whatſoever of a *mortal Nature* (as it is defined in the Church of *Rome*) was then thought capable of *Remiſſion* by the *penitential Acts* of the Party, (eſpecially by true *Contrition*) without *Confeſſion* to a *Prieſt* and *Abſolution* from him. And this is the true *ſtate* of the Caſe; and I can find nothing produced by him to this purpoſe which deſerves to be conſider'd.

*Hiſt. Confeſſ. Auric. c. 2.*

7. As the *publick Diſcipline* declined, Perſons were exhorted to make *private Confeſſion* of their Sins; if they could not be brought to *publick Penance.* Thence in the *Greek Church* came the *Penitentials* of *Johannes Jejunator* (who firſt took upon himſelf the Title of *Oecumenical Patriarch*, in the time of *Mauritius* to the great Offence of the Biſhops of *Rome*) and of ſome others after him.

*Morinus* grants that there was a great Alteration in the *Greek Church* about this Matter; he thinks it began with the Buſineſs of the *Penitentiary*; but after the publick Diſcipline was diſuſed, inſtead of that, he ſaith, *came up a ſecret Confeſſion and Penance*; which was left to the Honeſty and Piety of the Penitent, and not required by any Canonical Authority among them; and ſo he ſaith, it continued from the time of *Nectarius* to this Day, as to the People. So that we have a plain Confeſſion from him, that there is no Rule in the *Greek Church* requiring this *ſecret Confeſſion* of Sins in order to the forgiveneſs of them. But it is obſervable concerning the *modern Greeks*, that if Perſons do make *Confeſſion* among them, they think themſelves obliged to keep to the old *Penitential Canons*, and blame *Joh. Jejunator* for receding from them; for *Simeon* of *Theſſalonica* ſaith, *they had them from the Fathers, and the Fathers by Tradition down from the Apoſtles.* But although they are therein miſtaken, yet they ſhew how different their *Tradition* is from that of the *Roman Church*, which thinks it ſelf under no ſuch Obligation, but allows *Abſolultion* to be granted upon *Confeſſion*, and a right of Communion without Penance performed, for which there is no colour, as to any ancient Tradition either in the *Eaſtern* or *Weſtern Church.*

John Morin. *Com. de Pæn. l. 6. c. 22, 23. c. 23. n. 1, 2.*

In

In the *Western Church* we find the publick Diſcipline fallen to decay in the *ninth Age*, and *Charles* the Great ſummoning ſeveral Councils for putting things into as good an Order as they would then bear. In the ſecond *Council* of *Cavillon*, *A. D.* 813. we find a Complaint, *Can.* 25. *that the old Canonical Penance was generally diſuſed; and neither the ancient Order of Excommunicating or Abſolving was obſerved.* Which is a plain and ingenuous Acknowledgment that they had gone off from the *ancient Tradition* of the Church; and therefore they pray the Emperor's Aſſiſtance, *that the publick Diſcipline might be reſtored for publick Offenders, and the ancient Canons brought into uſe again.* From whence it follows, that at that time notorious Offenders eſcap'd with private Confeſſion and Penance; and even that was done by halves, *can.* 32. and ſome thought it not neceſſary to do it at all, *can.* 33. And upon this Occaſion, they do not declare it neceſſary for the *Remiſſion of Sins* to confeſs even the moſt ſecret mortal Sins to a Prieſt; but very fairly ſay, *that both are uſeful; for Confeſſion to God purgeth the Sin; and to the Prieſt, teaches men how their ſins may be purged. For God, who is the Author and Giver of Health, giveth it often by the Operation of his Power, and often by the means of Phyſicians.*

*Hiſt. Confeſſ. Auric. c. 25. n. 3.* *Boileau* yields, *that there were ſome then in the Roman Church, who denied Confeſſion to Men to be neceſſary*; but he ſaith, *they were Adverſaries and Rebels.* This had been a good Anſwer, if the Council had called them ſo; which it doth not, but on the contrary declares, *That God doth often forgive ſin immediately without the Prieſt's Interpoſition*, or elſe the latter Clauſe ſignifies nothing. And the moſt it ſaith before, is, *that Confeſſion to a Prieſt is uſeful in the Church*; which is not the thing diſputed by us, but the Neceſſity of it; and his Critical Obſervations of *Utrumque* ſignifie juſt nothing, unleſs he had proved that the Council had before ſaid that both were neceſſary, which it doth not. He *c. 29. p. 387.* doth not deny, *that the Opinion of the Sufficiency of Confeſſion to God alone did continue in the Church to the time of the Council of* Lateran, *and that it gave Occaſion to the Canon, which enforced the Neceſſity of a Confeſſion to a Prieſt*; but he adds, *that learned and pious Men may have falſe Opinions before the Judgment of the Church.* So that at laſt we find *Univerſal Tradition* is given up, and the Neceſſity of *Auricular Confeſſion* is reſolved into the Authority of the *Roman Church's* Definition, or rather, the *Pope's Declaration* of it, either with or without the Conſent of the *Lateran* Council. But he ſaith, *The Fathers did not ſpeak ſo exactly of the Trinity before the Council of* Nice; *nor the Greek Fathers of Grace and Predeſtination before* S. Auguſtin. If this be true, it is impoſſible to prove either of thoſe great Points merely by Tradition; for thoſe Fathers either delivered the Senſe of the Church, or they did not; if they delivered the Senſe of the Church, then either the Senſe of the Church was doubtful, or they did not underſtand it; if the Senſe of the Church were doubtful, then it is plain thoſe Doctrines could not be proved by Tradition; if the Senſe of the Church were not doubtful, but the Fathers did not underſtand it, then how is it poſſible that the *Church's Tradition* ſhould be an *Infallible Guide*, when even the Fathers of the Church were miſtaken about it? But I have ſufficiently proved, that not only before, but even after the Council of *Lateran* there was no *Univerſal Tradition for the Neceſſity of Auricular Confeſſion.*

APPEN-

# AN APPENDIX, IN

## ANSWER *to some late* PASSAGES *of* J. W. *of the* Society of Jesus, *concerning the* Prohibition *of* Scripture *in* Vulgar Languages *by the Council of* Trent.

SInce the Publication of the foregoing Book, I have met with a Reflexion upon it made by *J. W.* in the Preface to a *Treatise* lately *Reprinted* by him. Wherein, *he observes that a great part of the Objections made against them are either grounded on mistakes, or touch points of Discipline not of Faith, which alone they are bound to defend.* This last Clause I could not but wonder at, since the new Title of his Book is, *A Defence of the Doctrine and Holy Rites of the Roman Catholick Church*, &c. Why should *J. W.* take such needless pains to *defend the Rites of the Church*, if they are bound to defend nothing but Points of Faith? I had thought the Honour and Authority of the Church had been concerned in its Commands and Prohibitions, as well as in its Definitions and Decrees. And although it be not pretended, that the Church is Infallible in Matters of Discipline; yet it is a strong Prejudice against any pretence to Infallibility in a Church, if it be found to err notoriously in any thing of general Concernment to the *Catholick Church.*

But how comes my late Book to be made an Example? *As for instance*, (saith he) *I find in a Book newly Published, with this Title*, The Council of *Trent* Examin'd and Disprov'd by Catholick Tradition, *that for* 15 *Pages together Dr.* St. *labours to prove that there is no Catholick Tradition against Translating Scripture into Vulgar Languages.* Whereas I expressly say, that the *Prohibition* of reading the Scripture so translated without a particular License, was that which I undertook to shew could not be justified by any Catholick Tradition; And that there was a General Consent of the Catholick Church, not merely for the Translations of Scripture into Vulgar Languages, but for the free use of them by the People. Which I made out by these Particulars,

1. That where-ever the Christian Religion prevailed, the Scripture was Translated into the Vulgar Language for the Peoples benefit. Which I proved from the Ancient *Italick* Versions before St. *Jerom*'s time, the *Gothick*, *Persian*, *Armenian*, *Syriack*, *Coptick* and *Æthiopick* Translations; without the least prohibition of the Common use of them.

2. That where a Language grew into Disuse among the People there the Scripture was Translated into the Tongue which was better understood. And for this I instanced in the *Arabick Versions* after the prevalency of the *Saracens* in the Eastern and Southern Parts, and after the *Moors* coming into *Spain*.

3. That even after the Primitive Times, Christian Princes and Bishops did take Care that the People should read the Scriptures in their own Language. For Princes, I instanced in *Ludovicus Pius*, and *Alfred*; for Bishops, in *Waldo* Bishop of *Freising*; *Methodius* and *Cyrill*, &c.

4. That the Pope himself in the 9th Century did approve of it; and for a Reason common to all times and Churches, *viz.* that *All People and Languages were to praise God, and that God himself had so commanded.*

5. That *Gregory* VII. was the first Person who forbad the use of Scripture and Divine Offices in the Vulgar Tongue, and was not ashamed to own that the Church saw cause to alter several things from what they were in the Primitive Church.

6. That upon the setting up the Inquisition by *Innocent* III. this Prohibition took place in *France* and *Spain*, and other Places.

7. That some noted Divines of the Church of *Rome* have highly commended it; and said that the taking of it away would be pernicious and destructive to Faith and Devotion.

8. That the Prohibition in the Church of *Rome* is built on the Authority of the Council of *Trent*, which appointed the *Index* to be made, in which the fourth Rule forbids all Persons the use of the Scripture in the Vulgar Tongue without a particular License, and whosoever presumes to do it is to be denied Absolution.

9. From hence it follows, that the *Council of Trent* is evidently disproved, as to *Catholick Tradition*, for any Foundation of such a *Prohibition.*

And what now saith *J. W.* against all this? *He would gladly know against whom I dispute.* Against *J. S.* and all such who would make the World believe the *Council* of *Trent* did proceed upon *Catholick Tradition.* To prove I am mistaken, he tells me *in his sixth Chapter, I may find an Account of several new Translations of Scripture into Vulgar Tongues, made by Catholicks and approved in the Roman Church.* Then he

he mentions *an Engliſh Tranſlation made by the* Rhemiſh *and* Doway *Colleges*; *and in French by the Doctors of* Lovain; *and ſome others.* What now follows from hence? Is it any *Miſtake* in me to ſay, There was ſuch a Prohibition of Reading the Scripture in the Church of *Rome*, and inforced by the Rule made by Appointment of the Council of *Trent*? This had been indeed to the purpoſe if it could have been proved. I do not deny, that there have been ſuch *Tranſlations* made, where it was found impoſſible to hinder all *Tranſlations*; and the uſe of them have been connived at or allow'd to ſome particular perſons, whom they were otherwiſe ſecure of. But ſuch Tranſlations are like the *Galeniſts* allowing ſome *Chymical Medicines* to their Patients; they declare againſt their uſe as dangerous; but if the Patient will have them, then pray take them of my Apothecary, who is a very honeſt man and prepares miſchievous Medicines better than another. This is juſt the Caſe of the Church of *Rome*, as to *Tranſlations* of *Scripture*; If we aſk their Opinion in general, whether Tranſlations be allowable or not, their Anſwer hath been formerly very free and open, by no means; for they are very dangerous and miſchievous things. And here beſides thoſe I have already mentioned, I could produce many more to the ſame purpoſe. But alas! theſe men lived before the Age of *Miſ-repreſenting* and *Expounding*. Now all this is *Miſtake* on our ſide, and *Infallibility* on theirs. We cannot for our hearts underſtand their Doctrines or Practices aright, although we take never ſo much pains and care to do it. One would think by the preſent way of dealing with us, that the Church of *Rome* were like *the New Name on the White Stone, which no man knows but he that hath it*; and ſo it were impoſſible for any elſe to underſtand it, but ſuch as are in it. I thought my ſelf pretty ſecure from *Miſtaking*, when I pitched on the *Council* of *Trent* for my *Guide*. But it ſeems, I am *miſtaken* here too? How ſo? Did not the *Council* of *Trent* appoint the Congregation of the *Index* at firſt, *Seſſ.* 18? Did it not own that the Matters of it were prepared before its Diſſolution? And if there were a *Prohibition* of the free uſe of the Scripture in Vulgar Languages by the Rules of the *Index*, is not the Council of *Trent* juſtly chargeable with that *Prohibition?* Eſpecially when the Title in the *Roman* Edition is *Regulæ Indicis Sacroſanctæ Synodi Tridentinæ juſſu editæ.* Apoc. 2. 27

*Jacob Ledeſma* was one of the ſame Society with *J. W.* and he frankly owns the *Prohibition* of reading the *Scripture*, made by the Rule of the *Index*, to have been done by the Authority of the *Council* of *Trent*.

*Accedit ad hoc, locupletiſſimum Teſtimonium, atque Decretum ex Indice librorum prohibitorum per Patres à Tridentina Synodo delectos conſcripto & Authoritate Sanctiſſ. D. noſtri* Pii. 4. P. M. *comprobato Regula.* 4. Jac. Ledeſma. *De Divin. Script. quavis lingua non legend. c.* 51.

The *Faculty* at *Paris* in the Articles ſent to *Gregory* XIII. againſt the Tranſlation of *Rene Benoit*; ſeveral times own the *Rules* of the *Index* as done by the Council of *Trent*. *Quacunque Authoritate transferantur in Vulgarem linguam Biblia & edantur, vetat idem ſacroſanctum Concilium ea paſſim ſine diſcrimine permitti.*

The ſame *Ledeſma* goes farther, and vouches the Authority of the Council of *Trent* in this matter, from the Decree *Seſſ.* 23. c. 8. where it forbids all the Parts of the *Maſs* to be in the Vulgar Tongue. Which could not be reaſonable, if the Scripture were allowed to be tranſlated.

Alphonſ. à Caſtro *de hæret. Punit. l. 3. c. 6.*

*Alphonſus à Caſtro* thinks the caſe ſo alike, *that a prohibition of one amounts to a prohibition of the other too, becauſe the greateſt Part of the Office is taken out of the Scriptures, and if the Scripture may be tranſlated,* he ſaith, *it muſt follow that Divine Offices ought to be in the vulgar Tongue.* But to return to the *Index.*

*Concil. Trid. Seſſ. 25. c. 15.*

The Congregation of the *Index* was (as is ſaid) eſtabliſhed by the *Council* in the 18th *Seſſion* as the Council it ſelf owns in the laſt Seſſion; and withal, that the Rules of it were then formed, but *becauſe of the multiplicity and variety of the Books, the matter of the Index was referred to the Pope, and to be publiſhed by his Authority, as likewiſe the Catechiſm, Miſſal and Breviary.* So that the *Rules* of the *Index* have the ſame Authority in the *Church* of *Rome* with the *Roman Catechiſm, Miſſal and Breviary.*

*Pius* IV. in his Bull, when he firſt ſet forth the *Index* A. D. 1564. owns *that it was finiſhed by the Fathers appointed by the Council of* Trent, *but was remitted to him by the Council, that it might be approved by him and publiſhed by his Authority. And he ſtrictly commands the Rules of it to be obſerved under pain of Mortal Sin; and Excommunication, ipſo jure.* After him *Clement* VIII. in his (a) *Inſtructions* about the *Rules* of the *Index* owns them to be made by the *Fathers* of the Council of *Trent,* And the ſame Pope is ſo far from renewing *the Power of granting Licenſes to read the Scripture in the vulgar Languages,* that he declares againſt them. For by the 4th Rule of the *Index, the Ordinary and Inquiſitor by the Advice of the Pariſh Prieſt or Confeſſor, might permit Perſons to read the Bible in the vulgar Language, ſo the Tranſlation were made by Catholick Authors*; and it was apprehended by ſome, that the new Printing the *Rule* might be giving new Authority to Biſhops and Inquiſitors to grant Licenſes, therefore the Pope declares againſt it; and ſaith it *was contrary to the Command and Uſe of the Roman Church and Inquiſition, which ought to be inviolably obſerved.* In purſuance of this we find in the *Roman Index* of *prohibited Books,* theſe words, *Biblia vulgari quocunque idiomate conſcripta*; i. e. *All Bibles in vulgar Languages are prohibited.* Therefore I cannot underſtand how the giving Licenſe to Perſons ſince the *Declaration* of *Clemens* VIII. is conſiſtent with the Duty which Perſons of that Communion owe to the *Authority* of *the Roman See,* unleſs they can produce a *Revocation* of the Bull of *Clemens* VIII. and ſome latter Explications of the *fourth Rule* which take away the force of his. But inſtead of that, *Alexander* VII. who publiſhed the *Index* again, after *Clement* VIII. owns that the firſt *Index* was made by Authority of the *Council* of *Trent:* And it is obſervable, that in his Bull *A. D.* 1664. he not only prefixes the *Rules* of the *Index*, but the *Obſervations* and *Inſtruction* of *Clement* VIII. and confirms all by his Apoſtolical Authority; and injoyns the punctual Obſervation of the Orders contained therein inviolably; under the ſame pains which were expreſſed in the Bull of *Pius* IV. Therefore as far as I can underſtand, the Faculty of granting Licenſes to read the Tranſlations of the Bible is taken away as far as the Pope's Authority can do it.

(*) *Quod Indice & Regulis confectis per Patres à Generali Synodo Tridentina delectos ſancitum eſt— Præter ea quæ Tridentinorum Patrum Regulis ſupradictis decreta ſunt.*

*Qui ſacroſancti Concilii Tridentini auctoritate prodierat.*

To what purpoſe then are we told of ſome *modern Tranſlations,* as long as the uſe of them is forbidden by the Pope's Authority? And no Ordinaries can have Authority to grant Licenſes againſt the Pope's ſolemn Declaration to the contrary; nor can any of that Communion with good Conſcience make uſe of them. But

But I am told *there are Tranſlations approved in the Roman Church.* By whom have they been approved? By the Pope, or the *Congregation* of the *Index?* I do not find any ſuch Approbation given to any of them. But on the contrary, even in *France*, ſuch *Tranſlations* have been vehemently oppoſed by the Biſhops and Divines there, as being repugnant to the Senſe of the *Roman* Church. And this is apparent by a Book publiſhed by Order of the *Gallican Clergy*, *A. D.* 1661. Wherein it is ſaid, *that it was the common and unanimous Senſe and Practice of all Orthodox Perſons, that neither the Scriptures nor divine Offices ought to be put into Vulgar Languages, it being injurious to the Chriſtian Church, and giving Occaſion of Offence to the weak and unlearned.* How then can we imagine that ſuch *Tranſlations* ſhould not only be allowed but *approved* among them?

*E quibus patcat fuiſſe ſemper communem & unanimem Orthodoxorum omnium ſenſum ac uſum; divinos Libros ac Officia Eccleſiaſtica, vernaculo Idiomate neutiquam reddendi; utpote Chriſtianæ Reipubl. damnoſum, ac rudibus & imperitis ſcandali occaſionem præbens. Collectio Auctorum Verſion. vulg. damnant. Monit. ad Lector.*

And beſides the entire Treatiſes there collected againſt them, of *Card. Hoſius*, *Lizetius*, *Spiritus Roterus*, *Ledeſma*, *&c.* and the Fragments and Teſtimonies of ſeveral others; we have a particular account of the proceedings of the *Sorbon* as to this matter.

In the *Cenſure of Eraſmus*, *Dec.* 17. 1527. the *Sorbon* declared *Vulgar Tranſlations of Scripture to be dangerous and pernicious.*

The like Declaration had been made before *A. D.* 1525. *and that all Tranſlations of the Bible, or of the Parts thereof ought rather to be ſuppreſſed than tolerated.*

*A. D.* 1607. The Faculty again declared, *that it did not approve any Tranſlations of Scripture into the Vulgar Language.*

But *J. W.* inſtances, p. 26. *in ſome Tranſlations that have been approved*; as *a French Tranſlation by the Doctors of Lovain.* But in the *French Collection* before mentioned, I find, *that* A. D. 1620. Dec. 1. *a Debate aroſe in the Faculty at* Lovain *about it*; *and the Faculty declared that it by no means approved of it.*

Another is of *Rene Benoit*; which was ſo far from being *approved*, that it was firſt condemned by the *Faculty* at *Paris*, and then ſent to *Rome* to be condemned by the Pope; which was effectually done; and *Gregory* XIII. directed his Bull to the Faculty of Divinity in *Paris*, *Nov.* 3. *A. D.* 1575. wherein he doth expreſly *forbid this Tranſlation, and reject it with an Anathema.*

*Biblia ſupradicta omninò prohibemus, & ab Eccleſia Catholica ſub Anathemate rejicimus.*

And yet this very *Tranſlation* of *Rene Benoit* is one of thoſe made by *Catholicks* and *approved in the Roman Church*; which *J. W.* refers me to. One of us two muſt needs be under a great Miſtake, but to whom it belongs I leave the Reader to determine.

The ſenſe of the *Gallican Clergy* in this matter doth fully appear by the Repreſentation which they ſent to *Alexander* VII. about the *Tranſlation* of the *Miſſal* into *French.* Which was done by *Voiſin* a *Doctor* of the *Faculty*, and was publiſhed at *Paris* by the Permiſſion of *Cardinal de Retz* Archbiſhop there, and had the Approbation of ſome Doctors of the *Sorbon.* The reſt of the Biſhops and Clergy highly reſented this matter, and aſſembled together to conſult about it, *Nov.* 29. 1660. where they propoſed two things to be conſidered. 1. The matter of Right, whether ſuch a Tranſlation were to be permitted or not. 2. The matter of Fact, whether this were a good Tranſlation or not. The Debate was adjourned

adjourned to *Dec.* 3. and from thence to the Seventh, on which they came to a Reſolution to ſuppreſs it. And a Circular Letter was ſent to all the Biſhops to forbid the uſe of it under pain of Excommunication; and the King deſired to interpoſe his Authority in it. *Dec.* 9. they agreed to ſend an account of the whole matter to the Pope in the name of the *Gallican Clergy*; wherein they declare their great diſlike of it, *as contrary to the Cuſtom of the Church, and as pernicious to the Souls of Men.* And in the Body of it, they ſay *they look on the Tranſlations of Scripture into vulgar Languages as the great occaſion of the Northern Hereſies*; *and quote* Vincentius Lirinenſis, *ſaying that the Scripture is the Book of Hereticks.* And after add, *that they had ſent to the Pope their Condemnation of all Tranſlations of Scripture and Divine Offices into the Vulgar Languages.* This was ſubſcribed by the *General Aſſembly* of the *Clergy*, Jan. 7. 1661.

*Illam omnino improbamus tanquam ab Eccleſiæ conſuetudine alienam, nec niſi cum ingenti animarum pernicie conjunctam.*

The Pope ſent a *Brief* in Anſwer, which was received *Feb.* 25. wherein he very Tragically complains, *that ſome Sons of Perdition in* France *had to the ruine of Souls, and in Contempt of the Church's Laws and Practice, arrived to that degree of madneſs as to tranſlate the Roman Miſſal into French.* And he charges the doing of it not only with *Novelty*, but *Diſobedience, Sedition, Schiſm*, &c. and declares *that he abhorred and deteſted it*; *and for ever damned, reprobated and forbad it, under pain of Excommunication*; *and requires all Perſons to deliver up their Books to the ſeveral Ordinaries that they might be burnt.*

I now deſire *J. W.* to inform me whether we are bound to believe that in *France Tranſlations of Scripture into the vulgar Language are allowed and approved?* I am really ſo unwilling to *miſtake*, that I take the beſt care I can to be rightly informed. I have no deſign either to deceive others, or to be deceived my ſelf; and therefore have not truſted to ſecond-hand Evidence; but ſearched and conſidered the Authors themſelves, whoſe Teſtimonies I rely upon. I am certain I have fallen into no willful miſtake, but have truly and impartially ſtated things according to the cleareſt Evidence I could find; and therefore I think it ſomewhat hard to be told, *that our Objections are grounded on Miſtakes*, and eſpecially as to this matter *about the Prohibition of reading Scripture in the vulgar Language*; for I hope I have made it appear not only that there is ſuch a *Prohibition*, but that it is founded on the *Authority* of the *Council* of *Trent.*

And if it be ſo, then it ſerves my main deſign, *viz.* to prove that it went off from *Catholick Tradition*, for if there were ſo many Tranſlations of old without the leaſt prohibition, and there be ſince the *Council* of *Trent*, ſo ſevere a one, back'd with the Pope's Authority, here muſt a very great change in *Tradition.* For that is accounted *pernicious and miſchievous to the Souls of Men*, which before was accounted uſeful and beneficial to them. If the Phyſicians in one Age ſhould condemn the common Reading of *Hippocrates* and *Galen* as deſtructive to the Health of mens bodies, which thoſe of former Ages extremely commended, would not any one ſay, there was a great Change in the Opinions of Phyſicians, and that they did by no means hold to the Judgment of thoſe before them? If the common Lawyers ſhould now ſay *Littleton*'s *Tenures* is a Book very unfit to be read by young Lawyers, that it fills their Heads with ſeditious and dangerous Principles, and therefore ought to

be

be taken out of their Hands; would not any one ſay, here is a wonderful Change, for no ſuch thing was ever apprehended before, but the Book was thought very uſeful and proper to inſtruct Students in ſome fundamental Points of the Law?

When *Manna was rained from Heaven in the Wilderneſs for* 40 *years*, and for 30 of them every Man gathered his own ſhare and proportion, and ate of it as he ſaw cauſe; would it not have been thought a ſtrange alteration among them, if after 30 years a ſett of Phyſicians ſhould have riſen up and told the People, "It was true, *Manna was Angels food*, but "if they had not great care in the taking it, and uſed it promiſcuouſly, "it would turn them to *Devils*; or at leaſt it would fill them with "ſuch Diſtempers, as they would never be able to reach to *Canaan?* This might be pretended to be great Care and Tenderneſs of them, in theſe *new Phyſicians*; but on the other ſide, they would tell them, "they had done very well with their eating Manna for 30 years toge-"ther; and there had been no ſuch Diſtempers among them, but ſuch "as human Nature is always ſubject to; that ſuch an alteration might "be of worſe Conſequence than their common uſe of Manna; for ſo "it was at firſt appointed and ſo it had continued, and they could not "tell but their new Phyſicians might be worſe to them than their old "Diſtempers; and they could never believe that could be ſo hurtful "which God himſelf had appointed for their Food.

The former Diſcourſe makes the Application needleſs.

But after all, it is ſaid: *This is but a point of Diſcipline and not of Faith*; *and in ſuch the Church may change her Meaſures.* To that I anſwer,

1. It is more than a point of Diſcipline, for it is changing the *Rule* of *Faith*, with reſpect to the People. While the Scriptures were in the hands of the People, they reſolved their Faith into the *Word of God*, as it was deliver'd to them and underſtood by them. But when that is taken out of their Hands and they are bid to Truſt to the *Church's Teſtimony* for matters of Faith; they have a different Reſolution of their Faith and a different Ground and Reaſon of believing. For they cannot ground their Faith upon a written Rule who are uncapable of underſtanding it.

2. It is no matter of Diſcipline to overthrow the deſign of publiſhing the Scripture for the univerſal Benefit of the Church of God. And this the *Janſeniſts* have well proved in Defence of their Tranſlation of the New Teſtament againſt the Prohibitions of it. "For, ſay they, the "Prohibition of reading the Scripture under pain of Excommunicati-"on, is it ſelf contrary to the Goſpel and ought not to be obey'd. For "Bread and Nouriſhment is not more neceſſary to preſerve the Life of "the Body, than the Word of God is to uphold the Life of the Soul. "That for Men to ſpeak of ſo much danger in reading the Scripture is "to reflect very diſhonourably on the Providence and Goodneſs of God; "for it was by means of Tranſlations in Vulgar Languages that God's "Word came to be known to the World, and the Goſpel was at firſt "publiſhed in thoſe Tongues, which were moſt generally underſtood. "And therefore thoſe do manifeſtly oppoſe the deſign and method of "Providence for advancing the Goſpel, who decry Tranſlations of Scrip-"ture, as pernicious to the Souls of Men. And farther, that ſuch a "prohibition

*Dialogue* 1. p. 26, 29.

P. 63.

" prohibition, is a Contempt of our Lord Jesus Christ, and a design to " suppress the Gospel; and a Contradiction to the Will and Command " of God; A Contempt of the Scripture, which was intended to be un- " derstood by all; A Contempt both of Councils and Fathers, which " looked on the Scripture as the best Judge of Controversies, and who " advised all believers to a continual reading of the Word of God.

If after all this, the *Council* of *Trent* could so notoriously err not only against *Scripture* and *Reason*, but *Tradition* too in such a Matter of Concernment to the Souls of Men, as this is, it will be hardly possible to persuade Men, it could not as well err in any Point of Faith. And it renders the whole proceeding suspicious as to particular Points, when the *Rule* of *Faith* is so industriously kept out of the hands of the People. For those who follow their Instructions, are never ashamed to produce their Credentials.

*Dialogues in Answer to T. G. Part. 4.*

As to what *J. W.* saith in his Book concerning *Jupiter*, &c. I had answered it so fully many years since, that I have Reason to expect a Reply to what I had there said in my own Vindication, before I can think it fit to trouble the World with needless Repetitions. And it were hard for me to be put to Answer again to the same things, when a Person will not take the pains to see whether he were not answer'd already.

THE

# THE DOCTRINES AND PRACTICES OF THE Church of ROME TRULY REPRESNTED;

In Answer to a Book Intituled,

*A* PAPIST *Misrepresented, and Represented*, &c.

## AN *ANSWER* to the *INTRODUCTION.*

THE *Introduction* consists of two parts,

I. A general Complaint of the *Papists* being *Misrepresented* among us.

II. An Account of the Method he hath taken to clear them from these *Misrepresentations.*

I. As to the *First*; Whether it be just, or not, must be examin'd in the several Particulars. But here we must consider, whether it serves the End it is designed for in this place, which is, to gain the Reader's good Opinion of their Innocency: Not merely because they complain so much of being injured, but because the best Men in all Times have been *misrepresented*; as he proves at large in this *Introduction*, from several Examples of the Old and New *Testament*, *but especially of Christ and his Apostles, and the Primitive Christians.* But it is observable, that when Bp. *Jewel* began his excellent *Apology* for the *Church* of *England*, with a Complaint much of the same Nature, and produced the very same Examples, his Adversary would by no means allow it to have any Force, being, as he called it, *Exordium Commune*, which might be used on both sides, and therefore could be proper to neither. And altho' it be reasonable only for those to complain of being *misrepresented*, who having Truth on their side, do notwithstanding suffer under the Imputation of Error; yet it is possible for those who are very much

*miſtaken*, to complain of being *miſrepreſented*; and while they go about to remove the Miſrepreſentations of others, to make new Ones of their own. And as the beſt Men, and the beſt Things, have been miſrepreſented; ſo other Men have been as apt to complain of it; and the worſt Things are as much miſrepreſented, when they are made to appear not ſo bad as they are. For *Evil* is as truly miſrepreſented under the appearance of *Good*, as *Good* under the appearance of *Evil*; as it is hard to determine whether hath done the greater Miſchief.

So that if *the Father of Lies be the Author of Miſrepreſenting*, (as the *Introduction* begins) we muſt have a care of him both ways. For when he *tried this black Art in Paradiſe*, (as our Author ſpeaks) it was both by miſrepreſenting the Command, and the Danger of tranſgreſſing it. He did not only make the Command appear otherwiſe than it was; but he did very much leſſen the Puniſhment of Diſobedience, and by that means deluded our firſt Parents into that Sin and Miſery, under which their Poſterity ſtill ſuffers. Which ought to be a Caution to them, how dangerous it is to break the Law of God under the faireſt Colour and Pretences; and that they ſhould not be eaſily impoſed upon by falſe Gloſſes, and plauſible Repreſentations, though made by ſuch as therein pretend to be *Angels of Light*.

But altho' *the Father of Lies be the Author of Miſrepreſenting:* yet we have no reaſon to think, but that if he were to plead his own Cauſe to Mankind, he would very much complain of being *miſrepreſented* by them; and even in this reſpect, when they make him the *Father* of thoſe *Lies* which are their own Inventions. And can that be a certain Argument of Truth, which may as well be uſed by *the Father of Lies?*

And the great Inſtruments he hath made uſe of in deceiving and corrupting Mankind, have been as forward as any to complain of being *miſrepreſented*. The true Reaſon is, Becauſe no great Evil can prevail in the World, unleſs it be repreſented otherwiſe than it is; and all Men are not competent Judges of the Colours of Good and Evil; therefore when the Deſigns of thoſe who go about to deceive, begin to be laid open, they then betake themſelves, to the faireſt Repreſentations they can make of themſelves, and hope that many will not ſee through their Pretences.

If I had a mind to follow our Author's Method, I could make as long a Deduction of Inſtances of this kind. But I ſhall content my ſelf with ſome few Examples of thoſe who are allowed on both ſides to have been guilty of great Errors and Corruptions.

The *Arians* plead they were *miſrepreſented*, when they were taken for Enemies to Chriſt's Divinity; for all that they contended for, was only ſuch a Moment of Time, as would make good the Relation between Father and Son.

The *Pelagians*, with great Succeſs for ſome time (and even at *Rome*) complained, that they were very much *miſrepreſented*, as Enemies to God's Grace: whereas they owned and aſſerted the manifold Grace of God; and were only Enemies to Mens Idleneſs, and neglect of their Duties.

The *Neſtorians* gave out, that they never intended to make two Perſons in Chriſt, as their Adverſaries charged them; but all their deſign was to avoid Blaſphemy, in calling the Bleſſed Virgin *the Mother of*

*God*; and whatever went beyond this was their Adverſaries *Miſrepreſentations*, and not their own Opinions.

The *Eutychians* thought themſelves very hardly dealt with, for ſaying, there was *but one Nature in Chriſt*; they did not mean thereby (as they ſaid) to deſtroy the Properties of the Humane Nature, but only to aſſert that its Subſiſtence was ſwallowed up by the Divine; and of all Perſons, thoſe have no reaſon to blame them, who ſuppoſe the Properties of one Subſtance may be united to another.

Even the *Gentile Idolaters*, when they were charged by the Chriſtians, *that they worſhipped Stocks and Stones*; complained, they were *miſrepreſented*, for they were not ſuch Ideots, to take things for Gods, which had neither Life, nor Senſe, nor Motion in them. And when they were charged *with worſhipping other Gods as they did the Supream*; they deſired their Senſe might not be taken from common Prejudices, or vulgar Practices, but from the Doctrine of their Philoſophers; and they owned a Sovereign Worſhip due to him that was Chief; and a ſubordinate and Relative to ſome Cœleſtial Beings, whom they made Application to as Mediators between him and them. Muſt all theſe Complaints now be taken for granted? what then becomes of the Reputation of General Councils, or the Primitive Chriſtians? But as, if it were enough to be Accuſed, none would be innocent; ſo none would be Guilty, if it were enough to complain of being *miſrepreſented*.

Therefore in all Complaints of this Nature, it is neceſſary to come to Particulars; and to examine with Care and Diligence the Matters complained of, and then to give Judgment in the *Caſe*. I am glad to find our Author profeſſing ſo much *Sincerity and Truth without Paſſion*; and I do aſſure him I ſhall follow what he profeſſes: For the Cauſe of our Church is ſuch, as needs neither Tricks nor Paſſion to defend it; and therefore I ſhall endeavour to ſtate the Matters in Difference, with all the clearneſs and calmneſs that may be; and I ſhall keep cloſe to his Method and Repreſentations, without Digreſſions, or provoking Reflections.

II. But I muſt declare my ſelf very much unſatisfied with the Method he hath taken to clear his Party from theſe *Miſrepreſentations*. For,

1. He takes upon himſelf to draw a double Character of a Papiſt; and in the one he pretends to follow a certain Rule, but not in the other; which is not fair and ingenuous.

As to the one, he ſaith, *He follows the Council of* Trent, *and their allowed Spiritual Books & Catechiſms:* and we find no fault with this. But why muſt the other Part then be drawn by Fancy, or common Prejudices, or ignorant Miſtakes? Have we no Rule, whereby the Judgment of our Church is to be taken? Are not our Articles as eaſy to be had and underſtood, as the Decrees and Canons of the Council of *Trent?* I will not aſk, How the Council of *Trent* comes to be the Rule and Meaſure of Doctrine to any here, where it was never received? But I hope I may, why our Repreſentations are not to be taken from the Senſe of our Church, as their's from the Council of *Trent?* If he ſaith, *his Deſign was to remove common Prejudices, and vulgar Miſtakes:* it is eaſy to anſwer, If they are contrary to the Doctrine of our Church, we utterly diſown them. We know very well there are Perſons, who have ſo falſe a Notion of *Popery*, that they charge the Rites and Cuſtoms of our Church with it: but we pity their Weakneſs and Folly,

and are far from defending ſuch Miſrepreſentations. But that which we adhere to, is the Doctrine and Senſe of our Church, as it is by Law eſtabliſhed; and what Repreſentations are made agreeable thereto, I undertake to defend, and no other. But if a Perſon take the liberty to lay on what Colours he pleaſes on one ſide, it will be no hard matter to take them off on the other, and then to ſay, *How much fairer is our Church than ſhe is painted!* It is an eaſy, but not ſo allowable a way of diſputing, for the ſame Perſons to make the Objections and Anſwers too; for he may ſo model and frame the Arguments by a little Art, that the Anſwers may appear very full and ſufficient; whereas if they had been truly repreſented, they would be found very lame and defective.

2. He pretends to give an Account why he quotes no Authors for his Miſrepreſentations, which is very unſatisfactory, *viz. That he hath deſcribed the Papiſt therein, exactly according to the apprehenſion he had of him when he was a Proteſtant.* But how can we tell what ſort of Proteſtant he was; nor how well he was inſtructed in his Religion? And muſt the Character now ſuppoſed to be common to Proteſtants be taken from his ignorant, or childiſh, or wilful Miſtakes? Did ever any Proteſtant, that underſtands himſelf, ſay, *That Papiſts are never permitted to hear Sermons which they are able to underſtand*, (p. 58.) *or that they held it lawful to commit Idolatry*, (p. 9.) Or, *that a Papiſt believes the Pope to be his great God, and to be far above all Angels*, &c. Yet theſe are ſome of his Miſrepreſentations, (*p.* 40.) Did he in earneſt think ſo himſelf? If he did, he gives no good account of himſelf: If he did not, he gives a worſe; for then how ſhall we believe him in other things, when he ſaith, *He hath drawn his Miſrepreſentations exactly, according to his own Apprehenſions?* It is true, he ſaith, *he added ſome few Points, which were violently charged on him by his Friends:* but we dare be bold to ſay, theſe were none of them. But let us ſuppoſe it true, that he had ſuch Apprehenſions himſelf. Are theſe fit to be printed as the Character of a Party? What would they ſay to us, if a Spaniſh Convert ſhould give a Character of *Proteſtants*, according to the common Opinion the People there have of them; and ſet down in one Column their monſtrous Miſrepreſentations, and in another, what he found them to be ſince his coming hither; and that in good Truth he ſaw they were juſt like other Men? But ſuppoſe he had falſe Apprehenſions before he went among them; why did he not take care to inform himſelf better before he changed? Had he no Friends, no Books, no Means to rectify his Miſtakes? Muſt he needs leave one Church, and go to another, before he underſtood either? If this be a true Account of himſelf, it is but a bad Account of the Reaſons of his Change.

3. The Account he gives of the other Part of his Character, affords as little ſatisfaction: For although in the general, it be well that he pretends to keep to a Rule; yet,

(1.) He ſhews no Authority he hath to interpret that Rule in his own ſenſe. Now ſeveral of his Repreſentations depend upon his own private Senſe and Opinions, againſt the Doctrine of many others as zealous for their Church as himſelf; and what reaſon have we to adhere to his Repreſentations rather than to theirs? As for inſtance, he ſaith, *The Pope's Perſonal Infallibility is no Matter of Faith*, (p. 42.) But there are others ſay it is, and is grounded on the ſame Promiſes which makes him Head of the Church. Why now muſt we take his Repreſentation rather

than theirs? And ſo as to the *Depoſing Power*, he grants, *it hath been the Opinion of ſeveral Popes* (and Councils too) *but that it is no Matter of Faith*, (p. 47.) But whoſe Judgment are we to take in this Matter, according to the Principles of their Church? A private Man's, of no Name, no Authority; or of thoſe Popes and Councils who have declared it, and acted by it? And can any Man of their Church juſtifie our relying upon his Word, againſt the Declaration of Popes and Councils? But ſuppoſe the Queſtion be about the Senſe of his own Rule, *the Council of Trent:* What Authority hath he to declare it, when the Pope hath expreſly forbidden all Prelates to do it, and referved it to the Apoſtolical See? Bulla *Pii* 4*ti* ſuper Confirmat. Concil. Tridentini.

(2.) He leaves out, in the ſeveral Particulars, an eſſential part of the Character of a *Papiſt* ſince the Council of *Trent*; which is, that he doth not only believe the Doctrines there defined to be true, but to be neceſſary to Salvation. And there is not a word of this in his Repreſentation of the Points of Doctrine, but the whole is managed, as though there were nothing but a difference about ſome particular Opinions; whereas in Truth, the Neceſſity of holding thoſe Doctrines, in order to Salvation, is the main Point in difference. If Men have no mind to believe their own Senſes, we know not how to help it; but we think it very hard to be told, we cannot be ſaved unleſs we renounce them too. And this now appears to be the true State of the Caſe, ſince *Pius* the 4th drew up and publiſhed a Confeſſion of Faith, according to the Decrees and Canons of the Council of *Trent*, wherein Men are not only required *to believe their Traditions as firmly as the Bible, the Seven Sacraments, Tranſubſtantiation, the Sacrifice of the Maſs, Purgatory, Invocation of Saints, Worſhipping of Images, Indulgences, Supremacy*, &c. but they muſt believe, *that without believing theſe things, there is no Salvation to be had* in the ordinary Way; for after the enumeration of thoſe Points, it follows, *Hanc veram Catholicam fidem extra quàm nemo ſalvus eſſe poteſt*, &c. *This is the true Catholick Faith, without which no Man can be ſaved*; *i. e.* The belief of theſe things is thereby declared as neceſſary to Salvation, as of any other Articles of the Creed. But it may be objected, *The ſubſcribing this Profeſſion of Faith, is not required of all Members of that Church.* To which I anſwer, That to make a Man a Member of it, he muſt declare that he holds the ſame Faith which the Church of *Rome* holds: And this is as much the Faith of the Roman Church, as the Pope and Council of *Trent* could make it. And it is now printed in the Roman *Ritual* at *Paris*, ſet forth by *Paul* the 5th, as the Confeſſion of Faith owned by the Church of *Rome*. And therefore this ought to have been a part of the true Repreſentation, as to the Doctrinal Points; but when he comes to the 35th Head, he then owns, *That unleſs Men do believe every Article of the Roman Faith, they cannot be ſaved*, (p. 96.) *and he that disbelieves one, does in a manner disbelieve all.* (p. 97.) Which may as well reach thoſe who diſown the Depoſing Power, and the Pope's perſonal Infallibility, as Us, ſince thoſe are accounted Articles of Faith by the ruling part of their Church, to whom it chiefly belongs to declare them; and the former hath been defined both by Popes and Councils.

(3.) He never ſets down what it is which makes my Doctrine to become a Doctrine of their Church. We are often blamed for charging particular Opinions upon their Church; but we deſire to know what it is which makes a Doctrine of their Church; *i. e.* whether frequent and publick

publick Declaration, by the Heads and Guides of their Church, be sufficient or not to that End? Our Author seems to imply the Necessity of some Conditions to be observed; for besides *the Pope's Authority*, he requires, *due Circumstances, and proceeding according to Law*, (p. 42.) But who is to be Judge of these Circumstances, and legal Proceedings? And he never tells what these *Circumstances* are. And yet after all, he saith, *The Orders of the Supreme Pastor are to be obey'd, whether he be infallible or not.* And this now brings the Matter home; *The Popes*, he confesses, *have owned the Deposing Doctrine, and acted according to it*: And others are bound to obey their Orders, whether infallible or not; and consequently they are bound by the Doctrine of their Church to act, when the Popes shall require it, according to the Deposing Power. But he seems to say in this Case, that a Doctrine of their Church is to be judged by the Number; for, saith he, *There are greater Numbers that disown this Doctrine*, (p. 47.) I will not at present dispute it; but I desire to be informed, Whether the Doctrines of their Church go by majority of Votes, or not? I had thought the Authority of the Guides of the Church, ought to have over-ballanced any Number of Dissenters. For, what are those who refuse to submit to the Dictates of Popes and Councils, but Dissenters from the Church of *Rome?* The distinction of the *Court and Church of Rome*, is wholly impertinent in this Case. For, we here consider not the mere Temporal Power which makes the Court, but the Spiritual Capacity of Teaching the Church; and if Popes and Councils may err in Teaching this Doctrine, why not in any other? I know there are some that say, *Universal Tradition is necessary to make a Doctrine of their Church.* But then no submission can be required to any Doctrine in that Church, till the Universal Tradition of it, in all Times, and in all Parts of the Christian Church, be proved. And we need to desire no better Terms than these, as to all Points of Pope *Pius* the 4th his Creed, which are in dispute between us and them.

(4.) He makes use of the Authority of some particular Divines, as delivering the Sense of their Church, when there are so many of greater Authority against them. Whereas, if we proceed by his own Rule, the greater Number is to carry it. Therefore we cannot be thought to *misrepresent* them, if we charge them with such things as are owned, either by the general and allowed Practices of their Church, or their Publick Offices, or the generality of their Divines and Casuists; or in case of a Contest, with that side which is owned by the Guides of their Church, when the other is censured; or which was approved by their Canonized Saints, or declared by their Popes and Councils, whose Decrees they are bound to follow. And by these Measures I intend to proceed, having no design to *misrepresent them*, as indeed we need not.

And so much in Answer to the *Introduction.*

## I. *Of Praying to Images.*

IN this, and the other Particulars, where it is necessary, I shall observe this Method.

1. To give a clear and impartial Account of the State of the Controversie in as few words as I can.

2. To

2. To make ſome Reflections on what he ſaith, in order to the clearing them from Miſrepreſentations.

As to the ſtate of this Controverſie, as it ſtands, ſince the Council of *Trent*, we are to conſider.

1. We muſt diſtinguiſh between what Perſons do in their own Opinion, and what they do according to the Senſe of the Divine Law. It is poſſible that Men may intend one thing, and the Law give another Senſe of it; as is often ſeen in the Caſe of Treaſon; although the Perſons plead never ſo much they had no intention to commit Treaſon, yet if the Law makes their Act to be ſo, their diſavowing it doth not excuſe them. So it is in the preſent Caſe; Men may have real and ſerious Intentions, to refer their final, ultimate and ſovereign Worſhip only to God; but if the Law of God ſtrictly and ſeverely prohibits this particular manner of Worſhip by Images, in as full, plain and clear Words as may be, and gives a denomination to ſuch Acts, taken from the immediate Object of it; no particular Intention of the Perſons can alter that denomination, or make the Guilt to be leſs than the Law makes it.

2. There can be no *Miſrepreſenting* as to the lawfulneſs of many external Acts of Worſhip, with reſpect to Images, which are owned by them. But it doth not look fairly to put the Title, *Of Praying to Images*; for the Queſtion is, *about the Worſhip of Images*; whereas this Title would inſinuate, as though we did directly charge them with *Praying to their Images, without any farther reſpect*; which we are ſo far from charging them with, that I do not know of any People in the World, who are not like *Stones and Stocks* themſelves who are liable to that Charge. The *PENDETS* in the *Eaſt-Indies* are fully cleared from it, by *Thevenot*, as well as *Bernier*. And it would be hard we ſhould not allow the ſame to our Fellow-Chriſtians. I do therefore grant what our Author ſaith, *viz. That all the Veneration they expreſs before Images, whether by kneeling, praying, lifting up the Eyes, burning Candles, Incenſe, &c. is not at all done for the Image, but is wholly referr'd to the things repreſented, which he intends to honour by thoſe Actions.* But I hope now, it is no miſrepreſenting for us to ſay, that *they do kneel, pray, lift up their Eyes, burn Candles, Incenſe, &c. before their Images*; which is all I charge them with at preſent.

Thevenot *Voyage des Indes*, p. 188. Bernier *Memoirs, Tom.* 3. p. 172. Page 3.

3. To perform theſe Acts before Images, without a deſign to worſhip the Images by them, is declared, by great Divines of the Church of *Rome*, to be next to Hereſie. The Caſe was this; There were before the Council of *Trent*, ſeveral Perſons who lived in Communion of that Church, but by no means approved the Worſhip of Images, ſuch as *Durandus*, *Holcot*, *Picus Mirandula*, and others. Now theſe Perſons thought fit to comply in theſe external Acts, but declared they intended not to worſhip the Images, but the Objects before them. Since the Council of *Trent* decreed Images were to be worſhipped, this Caſe hath been debated by the Divines and Caſuiſts of greateſt reputation among them: And *Suarez* ſaith, *This way of* Durandus *is dangerous, raſh, and ſavours of Hereſie*; and he ſaith farther from *Medina*, *That it was* Victoria's *Opinion, that it was heretical*; but he adds, that his own Opinion, *that Images were truly and properly to be worſhipped, was generally received by their Divines:* and therefore I need name no more.

Suarez *in* 3 *part, Q.* 25. *Diſp.* 53. *Sect.* 3. 2*do. principaliter, &* §. 5.

4. It is granted by their Divines and Caſuiſts, that the People in the worſhip of Images, may eaſily fall into Idolatry.

(1.) If

(1.) If the worſhip do not paſs from the Image to the Thing repreſented. And ſo *Aquinas* himſelf determines, That no irrational Creature is capable of worſhip, but as it hath reſpect to a rational Being. But here lies the difficulty, how an extrinſecal relation to an Object of worſhip, where the Thing is confeſſed to deſerve none, can give any reaſon for its being properly worſhipped. But they all grant, if the worſhip ſtop at the inanimate part, it can be no other than the worſhip of Stocks and Stones.

Bellarmin *de Imag. l.* 2. *c.* 24.

(2.) If the worſhip be given to the Image, which is proper to God alone. This *Bellarmin* is forced to grant, becauſe the Evidence is ſo clear in antiquity, that the *Gnoſticks* were condemned for ſome Worſhip which they performed to the Image of Chriſt. Now, we cannot think that theſe *Gnoſticks* were ſuch Sots, as to take the Image of Chriſt to be Chriſt himſelf; and therefore what-ever Worſhip it was, it muſt be relative, *i. e.* given to the Image for the ſake of Chriſt repreſented by it.

*Concil. Trident. Seſſ.* 25.

(3.) *If the People believe any Divinity to be in the Images, or put any Truſt or Confidence in them*; then the Council of *Trent* it ſelf owns ſuch to be like the Heathen Idolaters. Now, how ſhall it be known when the People believe Divinity to be in Images, but by ſome more than ordinary Preſence or Operation in or by them? by their having a greater Opinion of one Image than of another of the ſame Perſon? by their going long Pilgrimages to certain Images, in hopes of relief, when they might eaſily cauſe Images to repreſent at home?

And that ſuch are no extravagant Imaginations, is known to all who have heard of *Loretto*, or *Compoſtella*, or other Places nearer home. I need not mention the Complaints of *Polydore Virgil*, *Caſſander*, or *Wicelius*, to this purpoſe, who all died in the Communion of the Church of *Rome*; for the ſame is very lately complained of by a conſiderable Perſon in that Communion, who ſaith, *The greateſt part of the Devotion of the People of* Italy, Spain, *and* Portugal, *conſiſts in proſtrating themſelves before Images, and going in pilgrimage to them, and hoping for remiſſion of their Sins by ſo doing.* And another very lately yields, *That to avoid the peril of Idolatry, to which,* (he ſaith) *the People is evidently expoſed by the uſe of Images, it would be neceſſary to take them away from the Altars, and by no means to have them allowed for the Objects of Religious Worſhip.*

*Moyens Surs & honeſtes pour la Converſion de tous les Heretiques,* To. 2. p. 115.

*Entretiens de Philalethe & Philerene,* 2d Part, p. 157.

The Queſtion now is, Whether the Council of *Trent* hath taken any effectual Courſe to prevent theſe *Abuſes?* If not, what *miſrepreſenting* is it to charge the Abuſes upon the Doctrines and Practices allowed by it?

The Remedies preſcribed by the Council, are theſe:

1. *Declaring that there is no Divinity or Vertue in them for which they ſhould be worſhipped; and that nothing is to be deſired of them, or any truſt or confidence to be put in them.*

2. *Expreſſing their earneſt deſire, that if any Abuſes have crept in, they may be removed.*

But in the mean time the Council decrees, *the Images not only to be uſeful to be ſet up in Churches, but to have due Honour and Worſhip given them there, for the ſake of thoſe they repreſent; as not only putting off the Hat, but falling down before them.* And the *Roman Catechiſm* declares, *That this Worſhip is very beneficial to the People, and ſo much is to be told them; and that Images are to be in Churches, not merely for Inſtruction, ſed ut colantur,* that they may be worſhipped.

*Catechiſ. Rom. Part* 3. *c.* 2. §. 14.

*But*

*But what could the Council do more, than to desire all Abuses may be taken away? and is it not then the fault of others, and not of the Council if they be not?*

I grant, the Council doth desire *Abuses may be taken away, if any such be*, but then it enumerates those Abuses, in *Heterodox Images, in making gain of Images, in painting them too wantonly:* but besides, it doth say, *that all Superstition be removed in the sacred use of Images*; but it doth not say in *the worship of them*; and so it may relate to *Magick* and *Divination.* But that the Council could not prevent, or design to prevent the *Abuses* mention'd in the worship of Images, will appear by these things.

1. The Council of *Trent* allows the highest relative Worship to be given to them; it setting no bounds to it, so it be for the sake of the Prototypes.

2. It allows a Worship to be given to the Images themselves too; for it confirms the second Council of *Nice*, which decreed an inferior Adoration to be given to them.

3. It disapproves no Customs then practised among them in the Worship of Images; which were all known, and by many complained of, both as Pilgrimages to them, and the carrying them about in Procession, and the solemn Consecration of them; the Form whereof is not only inserted, but enlarged in the new Pontifical, since the Council of *Trent*. And it is to be observed, that in the old Pontifical, *A. D.* 1511, there is no Form for consecrating an Image; in that of *Paul* the 3d, it is inserted, but out of *Durandus*; but in that of *Clement* the 8th, it is put in more largely, and as authentically, as if it had been always there. And is not this the way to reform the worship of Images?

To come now to our Author's Reflections on the *Misrepresentation* he saith hath been made as to this Point.

1. *A Papist represented, believes it damnable to worship Stocks and Stones for Gods; to pray to Pictures or Images of Christ, the Virgin* Mary, *or any other Saints.*

These Expressions are capable of a double Sense, and therefore this is not fair representing.

(1.) *To worship Stocks or Stones for Gods*, may signifie two things: (1.) To believe the very Stocks and Stones to be Gods. And this we do not charge them with. (2.) To give to Images made of Wood and Stone, the Worship due only to God; and so by construction of the Fact, to make them *Gods*, by giving them *Divine Worship*. And if they will clear themselves of this, they must either prove that *External Adoration* is no part of Divine Worship, (notwithstanding the Scripture makes it so, and all the rest of Mankind look upon it as such, even Jews, Turks, and Infidels) or that their external Adoration hath no respect to the Images, (which is contrary to the Council of *Trent*) or that Divine Worship being due to the Being represented, it may be likewise given to the Image. And how then could the *Gnosticks* be condemned for giving Divine Worship to the Image of Christ, which *Bellarmine* confesses; and is affirmed by *Irenæus*, *Epiphanius*, S. *Augustine*, and *Damascen?*

(2.) *To pray to Images of Christ, or the Blessed Virgin*, may likewise be taken in two senses: (1.) To pray to them, so as to expect to be heard by the mere Images, and so we do not charge them with it. (2.) To pray to them, so as to expect to be rather heard by themselves for praying to them by their Images. And if this be not so, to what end are

the Prayers made in the Conſecration of Images, for thoſe that ſhall pray before them? To what purpoſe do ſo many go in long Pilgrimages to certain Images, if they do not hope to be better heard for praying there?

But he goes on: 2. *He keeps them by him indeed, to keep in his mind the memory of the things repreſented by them.* And is this all in good Truth? We will never quarrel with them, if this be true repreſenting. No, that he dares not ſay.

But, 3. *He is taught to uſe them*, p. 2. But how? *by caſting his Eye upon the Pictures, or Images, and thence to raiſe his Heart to the Prototypes.* And is this all yet? No.

But, 4. He finds a double conveniency in the uſe of them: (1.) *They repreſent, at one glance*; and Men may eaſily make good Reflections, as *upon the ſight of a Death's-Head, or old* Time *painted with his Fore-lock, Hour-Glaſs, and Sythe.* And will he undertake that Images ſhall be uſed in Churches for no other end? Was the Picture of old *Time* ever *conſecrated*, or placed upon the *Altar*, or elſewhere, *that it might be worſhipped*, as the *Roman* Catechiſm ſpeaks of their Images. (2.) *They cure Diſtractions, for they call back his wandring Thoughts to the right Object.* What is this *right Object?* the Image, or the Perſon repreſented? And that muſt be either a Creature, or God himſelf. If it be a Creature, doth not this imply, that it is made a *right Object of worſhip?* If God himſelf, how doth an Image cure our diſtraction, in the worſhip of an infinite inviſible Being, when the very Image is moſt apt to diſtract our Thoughts, by drawing them down from his Divine and Adorable Perfections, to the groſs and mean repreſentations of an Image? But are we yet come to the utmoſt uſe of them? No.

But, 5. *He cannot but love, honour, and reſpect the Images themſelves, for the ſake of thoſe they repreſent.* Will this content them, and will he promiſe to go no farther? It is hard to part upon Terms of *mere Reſpect, and decent Regard*, where there is no encroachment upon *Divine Worſhip.* And here we are at a ſtand.

But he goes farther. 6. And ſo he is come at laſt, *to Veneration before Images.* And is this all? Dares he deny *Veneration to Images*, when the Council of *Trent* hath determined it? *Eiſq; venerationem impartiendam?* What, is this Veneration *before Images* only? *Bellarmine* hath a Chapter on purpoſe to prove, that *true and proper Worſhip is to be given to Images.* And was he a *Miſrepreſenter? Suarez* ſaith, *It is an Article of Faith, that worſhip is to be given to them.* But if the Veneration be only before them, why are they conſecrated, and ſet up in Places proper for Adoration?

But, 7. *To ſatisfie any one that he is far from making Gods of his Images, he is ready to break them into a thouſand pieces.* What a conſecrated Image? Dares he take a Crucifix from the Altar, and tear it in pieces? This doth not look like *the Love, Honour, and Reſpect* he mentioned before, not to name *Veneration.* And I am afraid this is a ſtrain beyond true repreſenting: Yet at length he hath found ſome pretty Parallels for the *Veneration of Images* themſelves; and ſo we are come at laſt to the main Point. But this is not directly owned; yet in the way of his repreſenting, it is fairly inſinuated by his Parallels.

1. *A Chriſtian loves and honours his Neighbour, becauſe he bears the Image of God in his Soul.* But doth he therefore take him and ſet him before him when he kneels at his Devotion, to raiſe his Mind, and cure

his Diſtractions? Would he ſet him upon the Altar, and burn Incenſe before him, becauſe of the Image of God in him? Is there no difference between the *Object of Chriſtian Love*, and of *Divine Worſhip?* Nor between a Spiritual, Inviſible, Divine Image in the Souls of Men, and a Material and Corporeal Repreſentation?

2. *We may kiſs and eſteem the Bible, becauſe it contains and repreſents to us God's Word.* But when we kiſs and eſteem the Bible, we remember the Second Commandment is in it; and we dare not break his Law, when we pretend to honour his Word. But we think there is ſome difference between *Reverence* and *Reſpect* to the *Bible*, and *falling down* before an Image. The Circumſtances of the one declare it to be mere *Reſpect*, and a *Religious Decency*; and if the other be not *External Adoration*, we know not what it is.

3. *A good Preacher is loved, becauſe he minds Men of their Duty.* But what ſhould we ſay to him that ſhould therefore *kneel down and ſay his Prayers, and burn Candles and Incenſe before him*, out of a reſpect to his good Doctrine? Did S. *Peter*, or S. *Paul* like this, when Men would have worſhipped them? A good Preacher would tell them of their Duty, as they did; and take Men off from the worſhip of any Creature, animate or inanimate, and direct them to worſhip God alone, who made Heaven and Earth.

## II. *Of Worſhipping Saints.*

FOR the clear ſtating this Controverſie, theſe things are to be premiſed.

1. We do not charge them, *that they make Gods of dead Men, i. e.* that they believe the Saints to be independent Deities. For this our Author confeſſes, *were a moſt damnable Idolatry.*

2. We do not ſay, that the State of the Church of *Rome*, with reſpect to the worſhip of dead Men, is as bad as Heatheniſm. For we acknowledge the true Saints and Martyrs to have been, not only Good and Vertuous, but Extraordinary Perſons, in great Favour with God, and highly deſerving our Eſteem and Reverence, as well as Imitation; whereas the Heathen Deified Men, were vile and wicked Men, and deſerved not the common Eſteem of Mankind, according to the Accounts themſelves give of them. And we own the common Doctrine and Advantages of Chriſtianity to be preſerved in the Church of *Rome*.

3. We do not deny, that they do allow ſome external Acts of Worſhip to be ſo proper to God alone, that they ought to be given to none elſe beſides him. And this they call *Latria*; and we ſhall never diſpute with them about the proper ſignification of a Word, when the Senſe is agreed, unleſs they draw Inferences from it, which ought not to be allowed. To this *Latria*, they refer not only Sacrifice, but all that relates to it, as Temples, Altars, and Prieſts: ſo that, by their own confeſſion, to make theſe immediately and properly to the Honour of any Saint, is to make a God of that Saint, and to commit Idolatry.

4. They confeſs, that to pray to Saints, to beſtow Spiritual or Temporal Gifts upon us, were to give them the Worſhip proper to God, who is the only Giver of all good Things. For elſe I do not under-

ſtand, why they ſhould take ſo much pains to let us know, that whatever the Forms of their Prayers and Hymns are, yet the Intention and Spirit of the Church, is only to deſire them to pray for us, and to obtain things for us by their Interceſſion with God.

But two things cannot be denied by them.

1. That they do uſe ſolemn Invocation of Saints in Places of Divine Worſhip, at the ſame time they make their Addreſſes to God himſelf, with all the Circumſtances of External Adoration, with bended Knees, and Eyes lifted up to Heaven; and that this Practice is according to the Sect. 25. Council of *Trent*, which not only decrees an humble Invocation of them, but declares it to be Impiety to condemn mental and vocal Supplication to the Saints in Heaven.

2. That they do own making the Saints in Heaven to be their Mediators of Interceſſion, but not of Redemption, although Chriſt be our Mediator in both ſenſes.

And upon theſe two Points this Controverſie depends.

Let us now ſee what our *Repreſenter* ſaith to them.

Page 4. 1. *His Church teaches him indeed, and he believes that it is good and profitable to deſire the interceſſion of the Saints reigning with Chriſt in Heaven; but that they are either Gods, or his Redeemers, he is no where taught, but deteſts all ſuch Doctrine.*

There are two ways of *deſiring Interceſſion of others for us.*

1. By way of *Friendly Requeſt*, as an Act of mutual Charity; and ſo, no doubt, we may deſire others here on Earth to pray for us.

2. By way of *Humble Supplication*, with all the external Acts of Adoration: and we cannot think S. *Peter*, or S. *Paul*, who refuſed any thing like *Adoration* from Men, would have been pleaſed to have ſeen Men fall down upon their Knees before them; and in the ſame poſture of Devotion in which they were praying to Almighty God, to put their Names into the middle of their *Litanies*, and ſo pray them then to pray for them.

But how are we ſure that their Church teaches no more than this? I have read over and over the Council of *Trent*, and the *Roman Catechiſm* about it, and I can find no ſuch limitation of their ſenſe there, where, if any where, it ought to be found. The Council of *Trent* mentions both the *Prayers*, and the *Help and Aſſiſtance* of the Saints which they are to fly to. If this *Help* and *Aſſiſtance* be no more than their *Prayers*, why is it mentioned as diſtinct? Why is *their reigning together with Chriſt in Heaven* ſpoken of, but to let us underſtand they have a Power to *Help* and *Aſſiſt?* For what is their Reigning to their Praying for us? But I have a farther Argument to prove the Council meant more, *viz.* the Council knew the common Practice and Forms of Invocation then uſed and allowed, and the general Opinion, that the Saints had power to Help and Aſſiſt thoſe who prayed to them. If the Council did not approve this, why did it inſert the very Words upon which that Practice was grounded? They likewiſe very well knew the Complaints which had been made of theſe things; and ſome of their own Communion cried ſhame upon ſome of their Hymns. *Wicelius* ſaith, one of them, [*Salve Regina*, &c.] *is full of downright Impiety, and horrible Superſtition, and that others are wholly inexcuſable.* *Lud. Vives* had ſaid, *He found little difference in the Peoples Opinion of their Saints in many things, from what the Heathens had of their Gods.* Theſe things were known; and it was in their Power to have redreſſed them, by declaring what the

Wicel. *in Elencho Abuſuum.*

Vives *in Aug. de Civit. Dei. l.* 8. *c.* 27.

Senſe of the Council was, and that whatever Forms were uſed, no more was to be underſtood by them, but *praying to them to pray for them.* Beſides, the Council of *Trent*, in the very ſame Seſſion, took care *about reforming the Miſſal and Breviary*; why was no care taken to reform theſe *Prayers and Hymns*, which they ſay are not to be conſtrued by *the Senſe of the Words*, but by *the Senſe of the Church?* There was time enough taken for doing it; for the *Reformed Miſſal* was not publiſhed till ſix Years after the *Council*, nor the *Breviary* till four. In all that time, the *Prayers* and *Hymns* might eaſily have been altered to the *Senſe of the Church*, if that were truly ſo. But inſtead of that, a very late French Writer cries out *of the neceſſity of Reforming the Breviaries as to theſe things*; wherein he confeſſes, *Many Hymns are ſtill remaining, wherein thoſe things are aſked of Saints, which ought to be aſked of God alone; as being delivered from the Chains of our Sins, being preſerved from Spiritual Maladies, and Hell Fire; being inflamed with Charity, and made fit for Heaven. In good Conſcience*, ſaith he, *is not this joining the Saints with God himſelf, to aſk thoſe things of them which God alone can give?* And whatever Men talk of *the Senſe of the Church*, he confeſſes *the very Forms, and natural Senſe of the Words, do raiſe another Idea in Mens Minds; which ought to be prevented.*

*Entretiens de Philalethe & Philerene.* Part. 2. p. 160, 163, 165.

*But doth not the Roman Catechiſm explain this to be the Senſe of the Church?* I have examined that too, with all the care I could, about this Matter. And I cannot find any neceſſity from thence of putting this Senſe upon them. I grant in one place, where it explains *the difference of the Invocation of God and Saints*, it ſaith, *We are to pray to God as the Giver, and to Saints, that they would obtain things of God for us*; and then it adds, *the Forms differ, that to God*, is *Miſerere Nobis*, and *Audi Nos*; that to Saints is, *Ora pro Nobis.* Very well! And is there then no other Form owned or allowed in the Church of *Rome* to Saints beſides this? Hold a little, ſaith the *Catechiſm*, for *it is lawful to make uſe of another Form*; and that is, *we may pray to Saints too, Ut noſtri miſeriantur.* And how doth this now differ from that to God, but only in Number? But it adds, *that the Saints are very pitiful*; then ſurely we are encouraged to pray to them for *help and pity. Yes*, ſaith the *Cathechiſm, we may pray to them, that being moved with pity toward us, they would help us with their Favour and Interceſſion with God.* But yet this doth not clear the Matter; for elſewhere the *Roman Catechiſm* attributes more to *Saints* than mere *Interceſſion*; and we may pray to them for what is in their Power: For where it undertakes to give an exact Account of the Reaſon of *Invocation of Saints and Angels*; it there parallels them with *Magiſtrates under a King*, and ſaith, *they are God's Miniſters in governing the Church; Invocandi itaque ſunt quod & perpetuo Deum intuentur, & Patrocinium Salutis noſtræ libentiſſimè ſuſcipiunt.* What is this *Patrocinium ſalutis noſtræ?* Is it only *Praying and Interceſſion with God?* That cannot be; for it inſtances preſently in *deliverances by Angels, and* Jacob's *praying to the Angel to bleſs him*, and not merely to intercede for him. *But though this is ſpoken of Angels*, yet from hence it infers *the Invocation of Saints* too. But what need we inſiſt more on this, ſince they do own the *Miniſtry of Saints* as well as Angels, with reſpect to the Church; and do *Canonize Saints* for particular Countries, as lately St. *Roſa* for *Peru.* And where there is ſuch a particular Protection ſuppoſed, what incongruity is it to

*Catech. Rom.* Part 4. c. 6. n. 2, 3.

*Catech.* Part 3. c. 2. n. 4, 6. *Cum præſint nobis Sancti & rerum noſtrarum curam gerant.* Bellarm. *de Sanct. Beatit. l.* 1. *c.* 20. §. *deinde. Non ſolum ab Angelis ſed etiam à ſpiritibus beatorum hominum Regi & Gubernari fideles viventes. Id. ib. c.* 18. §. *nos autem.*

to interpret the Form of their Prayers, according to a Doctrine ſo received and allowed? But of this more under the next Head.

2. *He confeſſes that we are all redeemed by the Blood of Chriſt alone, and that he is our only Mediator of Redemption; but as for Mediators of Interceſſion, he doth not doubt but it is acceptable with God we ſhould have many.*

I would aſk, concerning this Diſtinction, the Queſtion which *Chriſt* aſked concerning *John's Baptiſm, Is it from Heaven or of Man?* No doubt there may be ſuch a Diſtinction of *Mediators*, if God pleaſe to make them. But who hath Authority to appoint *Mediators* with him beſides himſelf? Is it not uſurping his Prerogative, to appoint the great Officers of his Kingdom for him? Would any Prince upon Earth allow this, *viz.* when he hath abſolutely declared his Pleaſure, that his own Son ſhould preſent Petitions to him, that others ſhould take upon them to ſet up Maſters of Requeſts themſelves? Can any thing be plainer in the New Teſtament, than that God hath appointed the *Mediator* of *Redemption*, to be our *Mediator of Interceſſion?* And that his *Interceſſion* is founded upon his *Redemption?* As the *High-Prieſt*'s going into the *Holy of Holies* to intercede for the People, was upon the *Blood of the Sacrifice of Expiation*, which he carried in with him. If there were no Revelation in this Matter, there might be ſome reaſon for it. But ſince the Revelation is ſo clear in it, this Diſtinction looks juſt like the *Socinians* Diſtinction of a *God by Nature*, and a *God by Office*, which was framed on purpoſe to avoid the plain Text of Scripture which called Chriſt *God*. So doth this look as if it were intended to avoid that clear Text, which ſaith, *There is one Mediator between God and Men, the Man Chriſt Jeſus*. Which is preſently anſwered with this Diſtinction; altho' there be not the leaſt ground in that, or any other Text for it.

John 14. 13, 14, 16, 23, 24. Heb. 7. 25. & 9. 7, 24 1 John 2. 1. 1 Tim. 2. 5.

*Yes*, ſaith our Author, Moſes *was ſuch a Mediator for the Iſraelites*; Job *for his three Friends*; Stephen *for his Perſecutors: The Romans were deſired by St.* Paul *to be his Mediator, and the* Corinthians *and* Epheſians; *ſo almoſt every ſick Perſon deſires the Congregation to be his Mediator, that is, to be remembred in their Prayers.* P. 4. 5.

But is there no difference between Men praying for one another, and deſiring others to pray for them here on Earth, and an *humble Invocation* of the *Saints in Heaven* to be our *Mediators* of *Interceſſion* with God there?

There is a threefold diſparity in the Caſe.

1. Here upon Earth we muſt converſe with one another as Fellow-Creatures, and there is no danger of our having an Opinion thereby, that we are able to aſſiſt one another any other way than by our Prayers. But the Caſe is very different as to the Saints in Heaven, who by being addreſſed to there by ſuch ſolemn Invocation, may too eaſily be conceived to have the Power of beſtowing ſuch Bleſſings upon thoſe who call upon them.

2. Heaven is look'd on by all Mankind who direct their Devotions thither, as the particular Throne of God, where he dwells, and diſcovers himſelf after another manner than he doth upon Earth. And we are directed to pray to our *Father in Heaven*; where he is repreſented as infinitely above all his Creatures; and the great Concernment of Religion is, to keep up the apprehenſion of this diſtance between him and them. Now it is hardly poſſible to keep it up, if in the Publick Offices of Religion, in the ſolemneſt poſtures of Devotion, with Eyes lifted up to Heaven, they do make Addreſſes, both to God and to his Creatures.

3. Men

3. Men are ſure, when they pray to others on Earth to pray for them, that they do no more than they can juſtify in point of Diſcretion, when they ſpeak or write to thoſe that can underſtand what their deſire is: But no Man on Earth can be certain that the Saints in Heaven can do it: For it is agreed they cannot do it without Revelation, and no Man can be aſſured there is a Revelation; and it is not reaſonable to expect it; for they pray to Saints to pray to God for them, and they cannot tell what they pray for, unleſs God to whom they are to pray, reveal to them what it is they muſt pray unto him for. Is it not then the better, the ſafer, the wiſer way, to make our Prayers to him, who we are ſure is able to hear and help us; and hath promiſed to grant what we aſk in his Son's Name? But there is no *other Name*, either *under Heaven*, or *in Heaven*, whereby *we can be ſaved*, or our Prayers accepted, but His alone.

But our Author ſaith, *It is no part of his Faith, how the Saints in Heaven know the Prayers and Neceſſities of ſuch who addreſs themſelves to them*, p. 5.

But how comes it to be any part of his Faith, that they know them? *However he doth not doubt but God can never want means of letting the Saints know them*, p. 6. And is this a ſufficient ground for ſolemn Invocation of Saints? God doth not want Means to let the Emperor of *Japan* know a Requeſt any one here hath to make to him; but is this a reaſonable Ground, for him at this diſtance to make it to him? God doth not want means to let the Pope know what a mighty Service it would be to the Chriſtian World, to make a wiſe and truly Chriſtian-Reformation in the Church? but would this be a Ground ſufficient for me at this Diſtance, to make a Speech to him about it? I knew a Man who underſtood not a word of Latin, but yet would needs go to hear a Latin Sermon: ſome aſked him afterwards what he meant by it? and the chief Reaſon he gave was much like this, *God did not want Means to let him know what the Preacher meant.*

But after all; Suppoſe *God ſhould make known to the Saints what is deſired of them:* I aſk, Whether this be a ſufficient Ground for ſolemn Invocation? When *Socinus* was not able to defend the *Invocation of Chriſt himſelf*, ſuppoſing that he could know our Hearts only by Revelation: and he had nothing material to ſay, but only that there was a Command for it; which can never be ſo much as pretended in this Caſe.

As to what he alleadges of the *Elders falling down before the Lamb, having Vials full of Odours, which are the Prayers of the Saints*, *Apoc.* 5. 8. It muſt be ſtrained hard to be brought to this purpoſe, when both Ancient and Modern Interpreters take it for a Repreſentation of what was done upon Earth, and not in Heaven. And if it were in Heaven, Prophetical Viſions were never intended for a meaſure of our Duties. *If the Angels do pray for Mankind*, Zech. 1. 12. Doth it therefore follow we muſt pray to them? But we ſay, as the Angel did to St. *John*, Revel. 19. 10. in a like Caſe, *See thou do it not: worſhip God.*

III. *Of*

## III. *Of Addreſſing more Supplications to the Virgin* Mary, *than to Chriſt.*

HEre is no need of farther ſtating the Queſtion; this only relating to the extraordinary Service of the Bleſſed Virgin. And therefore we are preſently to attend his Motions.

*He believes it damnable to think the Virgin* Mary *more powerful in Heaven than Chriſt, or that ſhe can in any thing command him.* p. 6.

But in good earneſt, is it not damnable, unleſs a Man thinks the Bleſſed Virgin *more powerful than Chriſt?* Suppoſe one ſhou'd think her to have *an equal ſhare of Power with Chriſt*; Is this damnable, or not? Is it not ſetting up a Creature equal with God?

But what thinks he then of thoſe who have attributed an univerſal Dominion to her, over Angels, Men, and Devils? What thinks he not only of *Pſalters*, but of a *Creed*, *Litany*, and all the *Hymns* of *Scripture* being applied to her? All which was done by a Canonized Saint in their Church; and the Books printed out of the *Vatican* Manuſcripts, and dedicated to the Pope. And there we find ſomething more than an *Ora pro nobis* in the *Litany*; for there is *Parce nobis, Domina*, Spare us, good Lady: and *Ab omni malo, libera nos, Domina:* From all evil good Lady, deliver us.

*S.* Bonavent *Opuſc. Tom.* 1. *ad fin.*

What thinks he of another Canonized Saint, who ſaid, theſe two Propoſitions are both true, *All things are ſubject to God's Command, even the Virgin*; and *all things are ſubject to the Command of the Virgin, even God.* Was this damnable in a Canoniz'd Saint?

*S.* Bernardin. *Sen. apud Bernardin à Buſtis Marial.* Part 12. *Serm.* 2.

What thinks he of the noted Hymn?

*O felix Puerpera noſtra pians ſcelera*
*Jure Matris impera Redemptori!*

Balingham *Parnaſſ. Marian.* p. 208.

Was not this damnable? And I have not only ſeen it in the *old Paris Miſſal*, but *Balingham* a Jeſuit, ſaith, it was in the Miſſals of *Tournay*, *Liege*, *Amiens*, *Artois*, and the *Old Roman.* I could produce many other Paſſages cited by him out of the *old Offices* to the ſame purpoſe; but I forbear.

Mendoza. *Virid. Sacr. l.* 2. *Probl.* 1, *&* 4. Salazar. *pro Immac. Concept.* c. 22.

But I cannot omit the Approbation given to the blaſphemous ſaying of S. *Bernardin* by *Mendoza*, (who endeavours to prove *the bleſſed Virgin's Kingdom, not to be a Metaphorical, but a true and real Kingdom.*) And by *Salazar*, another noted Jeſuit, who ſaith, *Her Kingdom is as large as her Son's.* And we have lately ſeen how far this Divinity is ſpread, for not many years ſince, this Propoſition was ſent from *Mexico*,

*Hier. Peres de Nutros Lapidicina Sacra, Tr.* 1. *Sect.* 12. *N.* 148. Page 7.

*Filius non tantum tenetur audire Matrem, ſed & obedire*;

The Son is bound not only to hear, but to obey his Mother. And is it ſtill damnable for to ſay, *ſhe commands him?*

But our Author ſaith, What ever eſteem they have for her, *They own her ſtill as a Creature.* Is he ſure of that? What thinks he of another Saying, which *Mendoza* approves of, *viz.* of Chriſt's ſaying to his Mother, *As thou haſt communicated Humanity to me, I will communicate my Deity to thee?*

*Viridar. Sacr.* l. 2. Probl. 2. N. 11.

But

But it may be said, *We are by no means to judge the sense of a Church by some Mens extravagant sayings.*

I grant it. But I have something considerable to reply, *viz.* That we may easily judge which way the Guides of that Church incline, by this following passage: About ten years since a Gentleman of that Communion published a Book, called, *Wholsome Advice to the Worshippers of the blessed Virgin*; and the whole design of it, being printed in Latin and French, was to bring the People of that Church to a bare *Oro pro nobis* to the *blessed Virgin.* But this was so far from being approved, that the Book was condemned at *Rome*, and vehemently opposed by the Jesuits in *France*, and a whole Volume published against it.

*La veritable Devotion envers la S. Vierge Etable & Defendu par le Pere Crasset à Paris, A. D. 1679.*

Here I have reason to enquire, Whether the Virgin *Mary* then, according to the sense of the Church of *Rome*, be only a *Mediatrix* of *Intercession* or not, since so large Power and Dominion is attributed to her? And why should not her Suppliants go beyond an *Ora pro nobis*, if this Doctrine be received, as it must be, if the contrary cannot be endured? For that Author allowed her *Intercession* and *Prayer to her* on that account; but he found fault with those who said *she had a Kingdom divided with her Son; that she was the Mother of Mercy, or was a Co-Saviour, or Co-Redemptrix; or that she was to be worshipped with* Latria; *or that Men were to be Slaves to her.* Now, if these things must not be touched without Censure, and no Censure pass on the other Books; is it not easie to judge which is more agreeable to the Spirit of the Guides of that Church?

*Monita Salutaria B. V. Mariæ ad Cultores suos indiscretos, §. 3. n. 56. §. 4.*

But we have a fresh Instance of this kind at home, in a Book very lately published, *Permissu Superiorum.* There we are told in the Epistle, That not only *the blessed Virgin is the Empress of Seraphims——— the most exact Original of practical Perfection, which the Omnipotency of God ever drew; but that by innumerable Titles she claims the utmost Duty of every Christian, as a proper Homage to her Greatness.* What can be said more of the Son of God in our Nature? In the Book it self she is said to be *Queen of Angels, Patroness of the Church, Advocate of Sinners; that the Power of* Mary *in the Kingdom of Jesus, is suitable to her Maternity, and other Privileges of Grace; and therefore by it she justly claims a servitude from all pure Creatures.* But wherein doth this *special Devotion* to her consist? He names several Particulars.

Contemplations of the Life and Glory of holy *Mary*, the Mother of Jesus, *A. D.* 1685. Page 4. Page 8.

1. *In having an inward, cordial, and passionate value of the Maternity of* Mary, *and all other Excellencies proper to, and inseparable from the Mother of God.*

2. *In external Acts of worship, of eminent Servitude towards her, by reason of the amplitude of her Power in the Empire of Jesus.* And can we imagine these should go no farther, than a poor *Ora pro nobis?* He instances in these external Acts of her worship. (1.) *Frequent visiting holy Places dedicated to her Honour.* And are not those her Temples then? which *Bellarmine* confesseth to be a peculiar part of the Worship due to God. And the distinction of *Basilicæ* cannot hold here, because he believes the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin; and he will not pretend *to her Honour* is only for Discrimination. (2.) *A special Reverence towards Images representing her Person.* (3.) *Performing some daily Devotions containing her Praises, congratulating her Excellency, or imploring her Mediation; and by oft calling upon the sacred Name of holy* Mary, *&c.*

Bellarmin *de Cultu Sanct. l. 3. c. 4. init.*

3. *In having a firm and unshaken Confidence in her Patronage, amidst the greatest of our inward Conflicts, and outward Tribulations; through a strong Judgment of her eminent Power within the Empire of Jesus, grounded upon the singular Prerogative of her Divine Maternity.* I have not Patience to transcribe more, but refer the Reader to the Book it self; only the eighth Particular of *special Devotion* is so remarkable,
Page 12. that it ought not to be passed over, *viz. Entring a solemn Covenant with holy* Mary, *to be for ever her Servant, Client, and Devote, under some special Rule, Society, or Form of Life, and thereby dedicating our Persons, Concerns, Actions, and all the Moments and Events of our Life to Jesus, under the protection of his Divine Mother, chusing her to be our Adoptive Mother, Patroness, and Advocate; and entrusting her with what we are, have, do, or hope, in Life, Death, and through all Eternity.* And is all
Page 14. this no more than an *Ora pro nobis?* And it follows, *Put your self wholly under her protection.* What a pitiful thing was the old *Collyridian* Cake, in comparison of these special Acts of Devotion to her! But there are some extraordinary Strains of Devotion afterwards, which it is pity to
Page 22. pass over: As, *I will ever observe thee as my Sovereign Lady, Adoptive Mother, and most powerful Patroness, relying on thy Bowels of Mercy, in all my Wants, Petitions, and Tribulations of Body and Mind.* Could any thing greater be said to the Eternal Son of God? And in the *Praise:*

*Verse.* Open my Lips, O Mother of Jesus!
Resp. *And my Soul shall speak forth thy Praise.*
*Verse.* Divine Lady, be intent to my Aid.
Resp. *Graciously make haste to help me.*
*Verse.* Glory be to Jesus and *Mary.*
Resp. *As it was, is, and ever shall be.*

Then follows the Eighth *Psalm*, applied thus to her.

Page 24. Mary, *Mother of Jesus, how wonderful is thy Name, even unto the ends of the Earth!*

*All Magnificence be given to* Mary, *and let her be exalted above the Stars and Angels.*

*Reign on high as Queen of Seraphims and Saints; and be thou crowned with Honour and Glory,* &c.

*Glory be to Jesus and* Mary, *&c.*

In the next Page follows a *Cantique*, in imitation of the *Te Deum.*

Page 25. *Let us praise thee, O Mother of Jesus! Let us acknowledge thee our Sovereign Lady.*

*Let Men and Angels give Honour to thee, the first conceived of all pure Creatures,* &c.

I think I need mention no more; only three things I shall observe: (1.) That this is now printed *Permissu Superiorum*; and we thank them for the seasonableness of it, in helping us in *true Representing*, what their allowed Doctrines and Practices are. (2.) That this is published in *English*, that our People, as well as theirs, may be convinced how far we have been from unjust charging them as to such things as these. (3.) That at the same time they plead for keeping the Bible out of the hands of the People; wherein their Discretion is so far to be commended, since the Scripture, and this new Scheme of Devotion, can never stand together. There being not one word in the Bible towards it, but very much against it; and the Psalms and Hymns must be *burlesqu'd* to sound that way.

But what ſaith our Author to their *Roſaries*, wherein there are *ten Ave Maries to one Pater noſter*; which is accounted a ſpecial piece of Devotion; and great things are ſaid of the effects of it by *Alanus de Rupe*, and many others.

1. As to the *Ave Maries*, he ſaith, *there is no more diſhonour to God in reciting the Angelical Salutation, than in the firſt pronouncing it by the Angel* Gabriel *and* Elizabeth. But it may not be altogether ſo pertinent. But doth he really think they ſaid the whole *Ave Maria*, as it is uſed among them? Did the Angel and *Elizabeth* ſay, *Sancta Maria, Mater Dei, ora pro nobis peccatoribus, nunc & in hora mortis noſtræ?* If not to what purpoſe are they mentioned here? Page 7.

2. As *to the Repetition*; that, he ſaith, *is no more an idle Superſtition, than* David's *repeating the ſame words twenty ſix times in the* 136 *Pſalm.* But what is this to the Queſtion, *why more Supplications to the bleſſed Virgin than to Chriſt?* and not one word of anſwer is given to it. But *Alanus de Rupe* anſwers it roundly, *Becauſe the bleſſed Virgin is our Mediatrix to Chriſt the Mother of Mercy, and the ſpecial Patroneſs of Sinners.* This is indeed true repreſenting. *Alanus de Rupe de uſu Pſalterii, l. 1. c. 6.*

## IV. *Of paying Divine Worſhip to Reliques.*

FOR the right underſtanding this Controverſie, we are to conſider,

1. That there is a due Veneration to the Bodies of Saints and Martyrs, allowed on both ſides; and there is an undue worſhip of them, which is diſowned on both ſides. The due Veneration is, a religious Decency to be obſerved towards them; which lies in avoiding any thing like Contempt or Diſhonour to them, and uſing all ſuch Teſtimonies of Reſpect and Decency, which becomes the Remains of excellent Perſons; provided we are ſatisfied of their Sincerity, without having recourſe to Divine Omnipotency to prove them: which *Ferrandus* the Jeſuit runs ſo much to, to prove the Truth of many Reliques, worſhipped in the Church of *Rome* in many places at once. But that it is poſſible to exceed in the worſhip of true Reliques, even *Bellarmin* confeſſes, who ſays, *that God took away the Body of* Moſes, *leſt the People ſhould give Divine Worſhip to it.* And St. *Jerom*, as hot as he was againſt *Vigilantius*, yet he utterly denied giving any Adoration to the Reliques of Martyrs. It ſeems then it is very poſſible to exceed that way. Ferandi. *Diſquiſitio Reliquiaria.* *De Imag. Sanct. l. 2. c. 4.*

2. The Queſtion then is, Whether thoſe Acts of Worſhip which are allowed in the Church of *Rome*, do not go beyond due Veneration? For it is unreaſonable to ſuppoſe thoſe who give it, to believe thoſe Reliques to be Gods; and therefore it muſt be ſuch a Worſhip as is given to them, ſuppoſing them to be only Reliques of ſuch Perſons. The Council of *Trent* decrees Honour and Veneration to be given to them, but never determines what is due, and what not: it forbids all Exceſſes in drinking and eating, in the viſiting of Reliques; but not a word of Exceſſes in worſhipping of them, unleſs it be comprehended under the name of Superſtition. But *Superſtition* lies in ſomething forbidden, according to their notion of it: therefore, if there be no Prohibition by the Church, there can be no Superſtition in the worſhip of them. And if they had thought there had been any in the known Practices of the

Church, they would certainly have mentioned them; and becauſe they did not, we ought in Reaſon to look on them as allowed. And yet not only *Caſſander* complains of the great Superſtition about them; but even the *Wallenbergii* lately confeſs, that the Abuſes therein, have not only been offenſive to us, but to themſelves too.

*Caſſand. Conſult. Art. 1. Tract. ſpecial 4. Controv. 4.*

But what ſaith our *Repreſenter* to them?

*He believes it damnable to think there's any Divinity in the Relicks of Saints, or to adore them with Divine Honour*, p. 7. But what is this adoring them with Divine Honour? A true Repreſenter ought to have told us what he meant by it, when the whole Controverſie depends upon it. Is it only ſaying Maſs to Relicks, or believing them to be Gods? Is there no giving Divine Honour by Proſtration, burning of Incenſe, *&c.* Nothing in expecting help from them? Yes, *If it be from any hidden Power of their own.* But here is a very hard Queſtion: If a Man doth not believe it to be an intrinſick Power in the Relicks, may a Man ſafely go to them, *Opis impetrande causâ*, as the Council of *Trent* ſaith, in hopes of Relief from them? Is it not poſſible for the Devil to appear with *Samuel*'s true Body, and make uſe of the Relick of a Saint to a very bad end? Then, ſay I, no Relicks can ſecure Men againſt the Impoſture of Evil Spirits, who, by God's Permiſſion, may do ſtrange things with the very Relicks of Saints.

*But God hath viſibly worked by them*, ſaith our Author, *by making them Inſtruments of many Miracles; and it is as eaſie for him to do it now*, p. 8, 9. This is the force of all he ſaith. To which I anſwer.

1. It is a very bold thing to call in God's Omnipotency, where God himſelf hath never declared he will uſe his Power; for it is under his own Command, and not ours. But there is no Reaſon to deduce the Conſequence of uſing it now, becauſe he hath done it formerly. And that they may not think this is cavilling in us, I deſire them to read *Pere Annat*'s Anſwer to the Janſeniſts pretended Miracle at *Port Royal, viz.* of the Cure wrought by one of our Saviour's Thorns. There he gives another account of ſuch Miracles than would be taken from us. But where he ſaith, *It is as much for the Honour of God's Name to work ſuch Miracles now*; their own Authors will tell him the contrary; and that there is no ſuch Reaſon now, as in former times, when Religion was to be confirmed by them; and when Martyrs ſuffered upon the ſole account of the Truth of it; and therefore their Reputation had a great Influence upon converting the unbelieving World.

*Rabat. Joy de Janſeniſt, A. D. 1656.*

2. Suppoſe it be granted, yet it proves not any Religious Worſhip to be given to them. For I ſhall ſeriouſly ask an important Queſtion: Whether they do really believe, any greater Miracles have ever been done by Relicks, than were done by the Brazen Serpent? And yet, although that was ſet up by God's own Appointment; when it began to be worſhipped after an undue manner, it was thought fit by *Hezekiah* to be broken in pieces. What now was the undue Worſhip they gave to it? Did they believe the Serpent, which could neither move nor underſtand, was it ſelf a God? *But they did burn Incenſe to it.* And did that make a God of it? Suppoſe Men burn Incenſe to Reliques; what then, are they made Gods preſently? Suppoſe they do not, but place them upon Altars, carry them in Proceſſion, fall down before them, with intention to ſhew the Honour they do them; are not theſe as much as burning a little Incenſe, which could not ſignifie ſo much Honour as the other do? and it is hard then to make the one unlawful, and not the other.

## V. *Of the Euchariſt.*

THere are two material Points under this Head which are to be examined, becauſe he endeavours to ſet them off with all the advantage he can, *viz.* Adoration of the Hoſt, and Tranſubſtantiation.

### I. *Of the Adoration of the Hoſt.*

1. The Queſtion is far enough from being, Whether it be lawful to commit Idolatry? as our *Repreſenter* puts it. For the *Miſrepreſenter* ſaith, *That a Papiſt believes it lawful to commit Idolatry:* and to clear this, our Author gravely ſaith, *He believes it unlawful to commit Idolatry*, p. 9. As though any Men ever owned it to be lawful: Which is, as if the Queſtion were, Whether ſuch a Man committed Adultery, and he ſhould think to clear himſelf by ſaying, he believed it unlawful to commit Adultery.

2. The Queſtion is not, Whether Chriſt may be lawfully adored by us in the Celebration of the Euchariſt; which we are ſo far from denying, that our Church requires our receiving it in the poſture of Adoration.

3. The true Queſtion is, Whether the Body of Chriſt, being ſuppoſed to be preſent in the Hoſt by Tranſubſtantiation, be a ſufficient Ground to give the ſame Adoration to the Hoſt, which they would do to the Perſon of Chriſt?

And that this is the true ſtate of the Queſtion, will appear by theſe things.

1. The Council of *Trent* firſt defined Tranſubſtantiation, and from thence inferred *Adoration of the Hoſt*; as is moſt evident to any one that will read the fourth and fifth Decrees of the Thirteenth Seſſion: *Nullus itaque dubitandi locus*, &c. *i. e.* If Tranſubſtantiation be true, then Adoration follows. It's true, the ſixth Canon only ſpeaks of *Chriſt being there worſhipped*; but that ought to be compared with the firſt, ſecond, and fourth Canons, where the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation* is fully ſet down, as the Foundation of that *Adoration.*

2. The *Adoration* is not fix'd on the *Perſon of Chriſt, as ſeparate from the Hoſt*, but as making *one Object* of Worſhip together with it. And ſo the Council of *Trent* declares in the ſixth Decree; when it ſaith, *The Sacrament is never the leſs to be adored, becauſe it was inſtituted to be received.* This cannot be otherwiſe underſtood, than as relating to the Sacrament: and ſo *that* whatever it be, muſt be granted to be the Object of Adoration. 'By the Sacrament, ſaith Cardinal *Pallavicini*, is under- 'ſtood the Object made up of the Body of Chriſt, and the Accidents.' The Worſhip then being confeſſed to be Adoration, which is due to God alone, and that Adoration directed to the Sacrament as its proper Object; the Queſtion now is, Whether ſuch a Suppoſition in the Sacrament, doth juſtifie that Adoration?

Pallavicin. *hiſt. Conſil. Trident. l.* 12. *c.* 6.

Our Author ſaith, *He accounteth it moſt damnable to worſhip or adore any breaden God, or to give Divine Honour to any Elements of Bread and Wine*, p. 9.

Then,

Then, I ſay, by his own confeſſion, if it be only Bread, he commits Idolatry; for the Adoration he cannot deny. But our *Repreſenter* loves ambiguous Expreſſions, which to the People ſound very well, but have no ſincere meaning: for what is it he underſtands by his *breaden God?* If it be that he worſhips a God which himſelf ſuppoſes to be nothing but Bread, we do not charge him with it; but if it be what we believe it to be, the Subſtance of Bread, but himſelf believes to be turned into the Body of Chriſt, then he cannot deny his Adoration to be given to it.

All that can excuſe them is, the Suppoſition; and whether that will or not, is now to be conſider'd.

*Roffenſ. c. Oecolamp. l. 1. c. 2. Coſter. Euchicid. c. 8. n. 10. Catharin. in Cajet. p. 133, &c. Ed. Paris. l. 1535.*

1. If it be not true, themſelves grant it to be Idolatry. The Teſtimonies of Biſhop *Fiſher*, and *Coſterus*, are ſo well known to this purpoſe, that I ſhall not repeat them. And *Catharinus*, a Divine of Note in the Council of *Trent*, confeſſes it is Idolatry to worſhip an unconſecrated Hoſt, although the Perſon, through a Miſtake, believes it Conſecrated. And he quotes St. *Thomas* and *Paludanus* for his Opinion; and gives this Reaſon for it; *becauſe Chriſt is not worſhipped ſimply in the Sacrament, but as he is under the Species; and therefore if he be not ſo preſent, a Creature hath Divine Worſhip given it. As thoſe were guilty of Idolatry, who worſhipped any Creatures of old, ſuppoſing God to be there, as that he was the Soul of the World. They were not excuſed*, ſaith he, *that they thought they worſhipped but one God; becauſe they worſhipped him as preſent in ſuch a manner as he was not.* And this Book of his, he ſaith, in the Review of it, *was ſeen and approved by the Pope's Order, by their Divines at* Paris.

*Lugdun. 1542.*

2. If *the Bread were taken to be God*, our Author doth not deny it would be Idolatry, for that were to worſhip a breaden God. Yet here would be a Miſtake, and a groſs one; yet this Miſtake would not excuſe the Perſons committing it from moſt damnable Idolatry, as he confeſſes: Why then ſhould the other Miſtake excuſe them, when they ſuppoſe the Subſtance of the Bread not to be there, but the Body of Chriſt to be under the Species? *Yes*, ſay they, *then no Creature is ſuppoſed to be the Object of Worſhip.* But when the Bread is ſuppoſed to be God, it muſt be ſuppoſed not to be a Creature. There is no Anſwer to be given in this Caſe, *but that the Bread really is a Creature, whatſoever they imagined*; and if this Miſtake did not excuſe, neither can the other.

## II. *Of Tranſubſtantiation.*

Three Things our Author goes upon, with reſpect to this.

*P. 9, 10, 11, 12.*

1. He ſuppoſes Chriſt's words to be clear for it.
2. He ſhews the poſſibility of it, from God's Omnipotency.
3. He argues againſt the Teſtimony or Evidence of Senſe or Reaſon in this Caſe, from ſome parallel Inſtances, as he thinks.

1. *He believes Jeſus Chriſt made his Words good, pronounced at his laſt Supper, really giving his Body and Blood to his Apoſtles; the Subſtance of Bread and Wine being, by his powerful Words, changed into his own Body and Blood; the Species only, or Accidents of the Bread and Wine, remaining as before. The ſame he believes of the Euchariſt conſecrated now by Prieſts.*

This

This is a very eaſy way, of taking it for granted that the words are clear for Tranſubſtantiation. And from no better Ground, to fly to God's Omnipotency to make it good, is as if one ſhould ſuppoſe Chriſt really to be turned into a Rock, a Vine, a Door; becauſe the words are every jot as clear, and then call in God's Omnipotency, which is as effectual to make them good. I confeſs, theſe words are ſo far from being clear to me for Tranſubſtantiation, that if I had never heard of it, I ſhould never have thought of it, from theſe or any other words of Scripture, *i. e.* not barely conſidering the ſound of words, but the Eaſtern Idioms of ſpeaking; the Circumſtances of our Saviour's real Body at that time when he ſpake them; the uncouth way of feeding on Chriſt's real Body, without any Objection made againſt it by his Diſciples; the Key our Saviour elſewhere gives for underſtanding the manner of eating his Fleſh; and withal, if theſe words be literally and ſtrictly underſtood, they muſt make the Subſtance of Bread to be Chriſt's Body; for that is unavoidably the literal ſenſe of the words. For can any Men take *This* to be any thing but this Bread, who attend to the common ſenſe and meaning of Words, and the ſtrict Rules of Interpretation? Yet this ſenſe will by no means be allow'd; for then all that can be inferr'd from theſe words is, that when Chriſt ſpake theſe words, *The Bread was his Body.* But either Chriſt meant the *Bread* by *This*, or he did not; if he did, the former Propoſition is unavoidable in the literal Senſe; if he did not, then by virtue of theſe words, the Bread could never be turned into the Body of Chriſt. For that only could be made the Body of Chriſt which was meant, when Chriſt ſaid, *This is my Body.* This ſeems to me to be as plain and convincing as any Demonſtration in *Euclid.* Which hath often made me wonder at thoſe who talk ſo confidently of the plain Letter of Scripture, being for this Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation. But ſeveral Divines of the Church of *Rome*, underſtood themſelves better, and have confeſſed, That this Doctrine could not be drawn out of the literal ſenſe of theſe words; as it were eaſy to ſhew, if it had not been lately done already. It is enough here to obſerve, that *Vaſquez* confeſſeth it of *Scotus*, *Durandus*, *Paludanus*, *Ockam*, *Cameracenſis*; and himſelf yields that they do not, and cannot ſignify expreſly the Change of the Bread and Wine into the Body of Chriſt. For how can, *This is my Body*, literally ſignify, this is changed into my Body? If that Propoſition were literally true, *This is my Body*, it overthrows the change; For how can a thing be changed into that which it is already?

*Vaſq. in 3 Part. Diſc. 180. Q. 75. Art. 2. c. 5.*

2. *He believes Chriſt being equal to his Father in Truth and Omnipotency, can make his Words good.* We do not in the leaſt diſpute Chriſt's Omnipotency, but we may their familiar way of making uſe of it to help them out, when Senſe and Reaſon fail them. And therefore *Cajetan* well ſaid; "We ought not to diſpute about God's abſolute Power in the "Doctrine of the Sacraments, being things of ſuch conſtant uſe; and "that it is a fooliſh thing to attribute to the Sacrament all that God "can do.

*Cajetan. in 3 Part: Q. 75. Art. 1, 2, 3.*

But we muſt conſider what he ſaith againſt *Senſe and Reaſon.* *For the believing this Myſtery, he does not at all think it meet for any Chriſtian to appeal from Chriſt's Words, to his own Senſes or Reaſon, for the examining the Truth of what he hath ſaid, but rather to ſubmit his Senſes and Reaſon to Chriſt's Words in the obſequiouſneſs of Faith.* What! whether we know this to be the meaning of Chriſt's Words, or not? And thus

thus we ſhall be bound to ſubmit to every abſurd Interpretation of Scripture, becauſe we muſt not uſe our Senſes or Reaſon for examining the Truth of what is ſaid there. Can any thing be plainer ſaid in Scripture, than that God hath Eyes, and Ears, and Hands? Muſt now every Man yield to this *in the obſequiouſneſs of Faith*, without examining it by Principles of Common Reaſon? And we think we are therefore bound to put another Senſe upon thoſe Expreſſions, becauſe they imply a Repugnancy to the Divine Perfections. Why not then where ſomething is implied which is repugnant to the Nature of Chriſt's Body, as well as to our Senſes? But the Queſtion about judging in this Matter by our Senſes, is not, as our Author is willing to ſuppoſe, *viz.* Whether our Senſes are to be believed, againſt a clear and expreſs Divine Revelation; but whether the Judgment of our Senſes and Reaſon is not to be made uſe of for finding out the true ſenſe of this Revelation? And we think there is great reaſon for it.

(1.) Becauſe we have no more certain way of judging the Subſtance of a Body, than by our Senſes. We do not ſay our Senſes go beyond the Accidents; but we ſay, our Senſes by thoſe Accidents, do aſſure us of the bodily Subſtance, or elſe it were impoſſible for us to know there is any ſuch thing in the World.

(2.) Becauſe Chriſt did himſelf appeal to the Judgment of his Diſciples Senſes concerning the Truth of his own Body after the Reſurrection; S. Luke 24. 39. *Behold my Hands and my Feet, that it is I my ſelf: handle and ſee, for a Spirit hath not Fleſh and Bones, as ye ſee me have.* Now we think we have reaſon to allow the ſame *Criterion* which Chriſt himſelf did about the very ſame Body. Unleſs he had then told his Diſciples, that there was to be *another ſupernatural manner of Exiſtence* of the ſame Body, concerning which their Senſes were not to be Judges.

(3.) Some of the moſt important Articles of the Chriſtian Faith do ſuppoſe the Judgment of our Senſes to be true. As about the Truth of Chriſt's Body; whether he had really a Body, or only the outward Accidents and Appearance of a Body? if he had not, he did not really ſuffer upon the Croſs, and ſo the Sacrifice of Propitiation there offered up to the Father for the Sins of Mankind, is loſt. There was a great Controverſy in St. *John*'s time, and afterwards, Whether Chriſt had any real Body? Thoſe who denied it, brought Revelation for it; thoſe 1 S. Joh. 1. 1, 3. who aſſerted it, proved it by their Senſes, as S. *John* himſelf, *That which we have ſeen, and heard, and our hands have handled*, &c. He doth not tell Men, they muſt ſubmit their Senſe and Reaſon to the pretence of Revelation; but they ought to adhere to the Judgment of their Senſes concerning the Reality of Chriſt's Body. Since therefore Chriſt himſelf appealed to it, the Apoſtles made uſe of it, without any Caution or Limitation, we have great reaſon to rely ſtill on the Judgment of our Senſes concerning the ſame Object, *viz.* the Body of Chriſt.

3. But we muſt now conſider his Inſtances to overthrow the Judgment of our Senſes and Reaſon in this Point.

1. *He believes Chriſt to be God, though to Senſes he ſeemed nothing but Man.* Do we ever pretend to judge of Chriſt's Divinity by our Senſes? How then can this be pertinent, when our only Diſpute is about judging his Body, and the Subſtance of Bread and Wine by them? And yet the Senſes were of great uſe as to the proof his Divinity by the Miracles which he wrought; which if they had been like the pretended Miracles

Miracles in Tranſubſtantiation, could have convinced no Man, becauſe they could never ſee them.

2. *He believes the Holy Ghoſt deſcended on our Saviour, tho' Senſes or Reaſon could diſcover it to be nothing but a Dove.* If there were no reaſon to judge otherwiſe, the Judgment of Senſe were to be followed: But ſince the Scripture declares it was the Holy Ghoſt deſcending as a Dove, we have no reaſon to queſtion that Revelation. For we do not pretend that our Senſes are ſo far Judges of Divine Appearances, as to exclude the poſſibility of God's aſſuming the ſhape and figure of his Creature when he pleaſes, by moulding the Subſtance of a real Body into ſuch a Repreſentation. Thus we do not deny the poſſibility of an appearance of the Holy Ghoſt under Bread and Wine, if God thought fit, any more than under a Dove; and in this Caſe we do not pretend that our Senſes can exclude the preſence of a Spirit under the Elements; but that is very different from the preſent Caſe, for here the Subſtance is ſuppoſed to be gone, and nothing but Accidents remaining; and no ſpiritual Preſence of Chriſt is denied, but that of his Body, the very ſame Body which ſuffered on the Croſs.

3. *He believes the Man who appeared to* Joſhua, (*Ch.* 5. 13.) *and the three Men to* Abraham, (*Gen.* 18.) *were really and ſubſtantially no Men, notwithſtanding all the Information and Evidence of Senſe to the contrary, from their Colour, Features, Proportion, Talking, Eating, and many others.* And what follows from hence, but that Spiritual Inviſible Subſtances may be under the appearance of Bodies, and that our Senſes cannot be Judges of them? Which is not our Queſtion: but, Whether Bodies can be ſo preſent after the manner of Spirits, as to loſe all the natural Properties of Bodies? and, Whether a Material Subſtance can be loſt, under all the Accidents proper to it, ſo as our Senſes cannot be proper Judges of one by the other?

But our Author ſeems to grant this, in a natural way of the Exiſtence of a Body: but he ſaith, *Chriſt gives to his Body a ſupernatural manner of Exiſtence, by which being left without extenſion of Parts, and rendred independent of Place, it may be one and the ſame in many Places at once, and whole in every part of the Symbols, and not obnoxious to any corporeal contingences.*

This is to me a Myſtery beyond all comprehenſion by Senſe or Reaſon; and there is certainly a great difference between governing our Underſtandings, and giving them up, as we muſt do if this Doctrine hold good; for it overthrows any fixed Principles of Reaſon in Mankind concerning the Nature and Properties of Bodies.

For, 1. We muſt ſtill ſuppoſe the Body of Chriſt to be the very ſame individual Body which ſuffered upon the Croſs; but if it had no extenſion of Parts, and be reckoned independent upon Place, it ceaſeth to be a Body. It is granted, that after a natural way of Exiſtence, a Body cannot be in more Places than one: but let the way of Exiſtence be what it will, if it be a Body, it muſt be finite; if finite, it muſt be limited and circumſcribed; if it be circumſcribed within one place, it cannot be in more places, for that is to make it circumſcribed, and not circumſcribed; undivided from it ſelf, and divided from it ſelf at the ſame time. Which is a manifeſt Contradiction, which doth not depend only on Quantity or Extenſion, but upon the eſſential Unity of a Body.

2. If it be poſſible for a Body to be in ſeveral places by *a ſupernatural Exiſtence*; why may not the ſame Body be in ſeveral Places by *a Natu-*

*ral Exiſtence?* Is it not becauſe Extenſion and Circumſcription are ſo neceſſary to it, that in a natural Way it can be but in one Place? Then it follows that theſe are eſſential Properties of Bodies; ſo that no true Body can be conceived without them.

3. This *Supernatural Exiſtence* doth not hinder the Body's being individually preſent in one Place: My meaning is this; A Prieſt conſecrates an Hoſt at *London*, and another at *York*; is the Body of Chriſt at *London*, ſo preſent there by virtue of Conſecration, as to be preſent at *York* too, by this *Supernatural Exiſtence?* What then doth the Conſecration at *York* produce? If it be not, then its Preſence is limited to the Hoſt, where the Conſecration is made; and if it be ſo limited, then this *Supernatural Exiſtence* cannot take off its Relation to Place.

4. The ſame Body would be liable to the greateſt Contradictions imaginable: For the ſame Body after this *ſupernatural way of Exiſtence*, may not only be above and below, within and without, near and far off from it ſelf: but it may be hot and cold, dead and alive; yea in Heaven and Hell at once.

5. What is it that makes it ſtill a Body after this *ſupernatural way of Exiſtence*, &c. if it loſe extenſion and dependency on Place? If it be only an aptitude to extenſion, when that *ſupernatural Exiſtence* is taken off, then it muſt either be without quantity, or with it. If it be without quantity, how can it be a Body? if with quantity, how is it poſſible to be without Extenſion?

6. This confounds all the differences of Greater and Leſs, as well as of Diſtance and Nearneſs. For upon this Suppoſition, a thing really greater may be contained within a leſs: for the whole Organical Body of Chriſt, with all its Parts, may be brought within the compaſs of a Wafer; and the whole be in every part without any diſtance between Head and Feet.

7. This makes Chriſt to have but one Body, and yet to have as many Bodies as there are conſecrated Hoſts. No, ſaith our Author, *This ſupernatural manner of Exiſtence is without danger of multiplying his Body, or making as many Chriſts as Altars*, p. 11. But how this can be, is paſt all human Underſtanding: For every Conſecration hath its Effect, which is ſuppoſed to be the Converſion of the Subſtance of the Bread into the Body of Chriſt. Now, when a Prieſt at *London* converts the Bread into the Body of Chriſt there, he doth it not into the Body of Chriſt at *York*, but the Prieſt there doth it; therefore the Body of Chriſt at *London*, is different from that at *York*; or elſe the Converſion at *London* would be into the Body, as at *York*. But if not, what is the ſubſtantial Term of this ſubſtantial Change, where nothing but an accidental Mode doth follow? If there be any ſuch Term, whether that muſt not be a Production of ſomething which was not before; and if it be ſo, Chriſt muſt have as many new Bodies, as there are Conſecrations.

8. This makes that which hath no particular Subſiſtence of its own, to be the Subject of a ſubſtantial Change; for this is the condition of Chriſt's Body, whatever its manner of Exiſtence be, after the Hypoſtatical Union to the Divine Nature. For, when *Bellarmin*, *Petavius*, and others of their greateſt Divines, undertake, againſt *Neſtorius*, to explain the Hypoſtatical Union, they tell us it conſiſts in this, That the Human Nature loſeth its proper Subſiſtence, and is aſſumed into the Subſiſtence of the Divine Nature. From whence I infer, That the Body of Chriſt

*Bellarm. de Incarn. l. 3. c. 8.*
*Petav. de Incarnatione. p. 6. c. 1. §. 3.*

Christ, having no proper Subsistence of its own, there can be no substantial Change into that which hath no proper Subsistence, but into that which hath; and consequently the Change must be into the Divine Nature principally; from whence it will follow, the Elements losing their Subsistence upon Consecration, the Divinity must be united hypostatically to them, as to the Human Nature; and so there will be as many Hypostatical Unions, as there are Consecrations. And so this Doctrine not only confounds Sense and Reason, but the Mysteries of Christ's Incarnation too: Which I think is sufficient for this Head.

## VI. *Of Merits and Good Works.*

FOR the true stating this Controversy, we are to observe;

1. That we do not charge those of the Church of *Rome*, *That they believe Christ's Death and Passion to be ineffectual and insignificant, and that they have no dependence on the Merits of his Sufferings, or the Mercy of God for attaining Salvation; but that they are to be saved only by their own Merits and Good Works*, as the Misrepresenter saith, *Pag.* 12.

2. We do not charge them with denying the *necessity of Divine Grace in order to Merit; or with asserting that they can merit independently thereupon.*

3. We do by no means dispute about the *Necessity of Good Works*, in order to the Reward of another Life; or assert that Christ's Merits will save Men, without *working out their own Salvation*; but do firmly believe, that *God will judge Men according to their Works.*

The Question then is, *Whether the Good Works of a Just Man*, as our Author expresses it, *are truly meritorious of Eternal Life?* Which he affirms, but qualifies with saying, *That they proceed from Grace, and that through God's Goodness and Promise, they are truly meritorious.* But the Council of *Trent denounces an Anathema against those who deny the Good Works of Justified Persons, to be truly meritorious of the increase of Grace, and of Eternal Life.*

Pag. 31.

Concil. Trident. Sess. 6. Can. 32.

Here then lie the Points in difference; (1.) Whether such Good Works can be said to be *truly meritorious?* (2.) Whether those who deny it, deserve an *Anathema* for so doing? As to what relates to *God's Acceptance and Allowance, and his Goodness and Promise*, we freely own all that he saith about it; and if no more be meant, what need an *Anathema* about this Matter? There must therefore be something beyond this, when Good Works are not only said to be *truly meritorious*, but we are cursed if we do not say the same.

To make any thing *truly meritorious*, we must suppose these Conditions requisite.

1. That what we pretend to merit by, be our own free Act.
2. That it be not defective.
3. That there be an Equality between it, and the Reward due to it.
4. That there be an Obligation in Point of Justice, to give that Reward to him that doth it.

And from these Considerations, we deny that Good Works, even of Justified Persons, can be *truly meritorious.*

*Meritum eſt Actio libera cui Merces debetur ex juſtitiâ. Coſter. Enchirid. de Meritis bon. Oper. c. 7.*

1. It is granted by themſelves, That what is *truly meritorious*, muſt be a free Act of the Perſon who doth it. Now the Good Works of juſtified Perſons cannot be ſaid to be their own free Acts, if the Power of doing them depend upon Divine Aſſiſtance, and there was an antecedent Obligation upon them to perform them: So that they can do nothing but what they are bound to, as God's Creatures; and their very Power of doing it is from the Grace of God. If Men pretended to merit at another's hands by what God gives, there were ſome colour for it; but to merit from God himſelf by what he gives us, ſeems very incongruous. If I owe a Man an 100 *l.* and another knowing me unable to pay it, gives me ſo much to pay the Debt, this is no more than what may be called ſtrict Payment, as to the Creditor; but if the Creditor himſelf gives me this 100 *l.* to pay himſelf with, will any Man call this ſtrict Payment? He may call it ſo himſelf, if he pleaſes, but that only ſhews his Kindneſs and Favour; but it doth not look very modeſtly or gratefully, for the Debtor to inſiſt upon it as *true legal Payment.* Juſt ſo it is in Good Works done by the Power of God's Grace, which we could never have done without it; and therefore ſuch cannot be *truly meritorious.*

*In quantum homo propriâ voluntate facit id quod debet, meretur apud Deum, alioquin reddere debitum non eſſet meritorum. Aquin. 1, 2. qu. 114. artic. 1. reſp. ad 1.*

2. What is *truly meritorious* muſt not be defective; becauſe the Proportion is to be equal between the Act and the Reward due to it; which being perfect, requires that there be no Defect in the Acts which merit it. But this can never be ſaid of Good Works of juſtified Perſons, that they have no Defects in them. We do not ſay, they are not Good Works, but they are not exact and perfect; for although the Grace of God, as it comes from him, be a perfect Gift; yet as it Acts upon Mens Minds, it doth not raiſe them to ſuch a degree, but that they have Imperfections in their beſt Actions. And whatever is defective, is faulty; whatever is faulty, muſt be forgiven; whatever needs forgiveneſs, cannot be *truly meritorious.* But not only their Good Works are defective; but if they would merit, they ought to have none but Good Works, whereas the mixture of others renders the good uncapable of being *meritorious*, becauſe there is ſo much to be pardoned, as takes away all claim of *Merit* in the good they perform. And themſelves do not pretend, that Men can merit the Grace of Remiſſion; but it is very ſtrange that thoſe who cannot deſerve to be forgiven, ſhould deſerve to have an infinite Reward beſtowed upon them.

*Meritum ſe habet ad premium ſicut pretium ad illum quod emitur. Altiſiodor. l. 3. tr. 12. Abſoluta æqualitas inter mercedem & meritum ponitur per modum Juſtitiæ commutativæ. Bell. Juſtif. l. 5. c. 14.*

3. There muſt be an exact Proportion between the Act and the Recompence: for to merit, is to pay a Price for a thing; and in ſuch Acts of commutative Juſtice, there muſt be an Equality of one thing with another. But what Equality can there be between the imperfect Good Works of the beſt Men, and the moſt perfect Happineſs of another World, eſpecially when that conſiſts in the fruition of the Beatifical Viſion? For what Proportion can there be between our Acts towards God, and God's Acts towards the Bleſſed in Heaven? Let the Acts be of what Perſon ſoever, or of what Nature ſoever, or from what Principle ſoever, as long as they are the Acts of finite imperfect Creatures, it is impoſſible there ſhould be any Equality, or exact Proportion between them and the Eternal Favour of God, which is the Reward promiſed.

4. Where Acts are *truly meritorious*, there follows an Obligation of ſtrict Juſtice, to pay the Recompence due to them. But what ſtrict Juſtice can there be between the Creator and his Creatures, to recompence

the Service they are bound to perform; when their very Being, Power to act, Assistance in acting, and Recompence for it, are all from his Bounty and Goodness? But our Author would avoid all this, by saying, that though Good Works are *truly meritorious*; yet it is *through the Merits of Christ, and as they proceed from Grace, and through his Goodness and Promise that they are so*; *i. e.* they are truly meritorious, because it appears from all these things they neither are, nor can be meritorious. For,

(1.) How come the Merits of Christ to make Good Works *truly meritorious?* Are the Merits of Christ imputed to those Good Works? Then those Good Works must be as meritorious as Christ's own Works; which I suppose he will not assert. Or, is it that Christ hath merited the Grace whereby we may merit? But even this will not make our personal Acts truly meritorious; and the nature of Merit relates to the Acts, and not to the Power.

(2.) How comes the Power of Grace to make them *truly meritorious*; when the Power of Grace doth so much increase the Obligation on our side? If it be said, *That the state of Grace puts Men into a Capacity to merit:* we might more reasonably infer the contrary, that it puts them out of a Capacity of meriting; because the Remission of Sins, and the Favour of God, are things for which we can never make him any Recompence.

(3.) How comes a Divine Promise to make Acts truly meritorious? For God's Promise is an Act of mere Kindness, which is very different from strict Justice: and although by the Promise God binds himself to performance; yet how come those Acts to be more meritorious of Heaven, than the Acts of Repentance are of Remission of Sins? Yet none will now say, that there can be any Acts meritorious of that. Yet certainly there is as clear a promise of Pardon upon Repentance, as there is of Heaven upon Good Works: And if the Promise in the other case doth not make Repentance meritorious of Pardon; how can it make Good Works truly meritorious of Eternal Life? But notwithstanding, we do not deny God's Fidelity to his Promise may be 2 Tim. 4. 8. called *Justice*; and so God, as a *Righteous Judge*, may give a *Crown of Righteousness to all that follow St.* Paul's *Example*, without making Good Works to be *truly meritorious*.

## VII. *Of Confession.*

WE do not charge the Church of *Rome*, that in the *Power of Absolving, they make Gods of Men*, P. 14. as our *Misrepresenter* pretends.

2. We do not deny, *That Christ gave to the Bishops and Priests of the Catholick Church, Authority to absolve any truly penitent Sinner from his Sins*, (which he therefore needlessly proves out of Scripture) *and that such Absolution is ratified in Heaven.*

3. We are glad to find that our Author declares, *That no Man receives benefit by Absolution, without repentance from the bottom of his Heart, and real Intention of forsaking his Sins*, P. 15. by which we hope he means more than Attrition.

But

But yet there are ſome things which ſtick with us, as to the Doctrine and Practice of the Church of *Rome* in this Matter, which he takes no notice of.

1. That ſecret Confeſſion of Sins to a Prieſt, is made ſo neceſſary to Salvation, that an *Anathema* is denounced againſt all that deny it, when they cannot deny that God doth forgive Sins upon true Contrition. For the Council of *Trent* doth ſay, *That Contrition, with Charity, doth reconcile a Man to God before the Sacrament of Penance be actually received.* But then it adds, *That the deſire of Confeſſion is included in Contrition:* Which is impoſſible to be proved by Scripture, Reaſon, or Antiquity. For ſo lately, as in the time of the *Maſter of the Sentences*, and *Gratian* (in the 12*th* Century) it was a very diſputable Point, whether Confeſſion to a Prieſt were neceſſary. And it is very hard for us to underſtand how that ſhould become neceſſary to Salvation ſince, which was not then. Some of their own Writers confeſs, that ſome good Catholicks did not believe the neceſſity of it. I ſuppoſe the old Canoniſts may paſs for good Catholicks; and yet *Maldonat* ſaith, *That all the Interpreters of the Decrees held, that there was no Divine Precept for Confeſſion to a Prieſt*; and of the ſame Opinion he grants *Scotus* to have been. But he thinks *it is now declared to be Hereſy, or he wiſhes it were.* And we think it is too much already, unleſs there were better ground for it.

*Seſſ.* 14. *Can.* 6. *Seſſ.* 14. *c.* 4. Lomb. *l.* 4. *Diſt.* 17. Grat. *de Pœnit. Diſt.* 1. *c.* 90. *Quidam.* Greg. de Valentiâ *de Neceſſit. Confeſſ. c.* 2. *Maldonat. Oper. To.* 2. *de Pœnit. c.* 2, *&* 3.

2. That an *Anathema* is denounced againſt thoſe who do not underſtand the words of Chriſt, *Whoſe Sins ye remit, they are remitted*, &c. of the Sacrament of Penance, ſo as to imply the neceſſity of Confeſſion: Whereas there is no appearance in the words of any ſuch Senſe; and themſelves grant, that in order to the Remiſſion of Sins, by Baptiſm, (of which St. *Matthew* and St. *Mark* ſpeak in the *Apoſtles Commiſſion*) there is no neceſſity of *Sacramental Confeſſion*, but a general Confeſſion is ſufficient. And from hence the Elder *Janſenius* concludes, *That the Power of Remiſſion of Sins here granted, doth not imply* Sacramental Confeſſion. *Cajetan* yields, *There is no Command for Confeſſion here.* And *Catharinus* adds, *That* Cajetan *would not allow any one Place of Scripture to prove Auricular Confeſſion.* And as to this Particular, he denies that there is any Command for it; and he goes not about to prove it, but that *Cajetan* contradicts himſelf elſewhere, *viz.* when he wrote School-Divinity, before he ſet himſelf to the ſtudy of the Scriptures. *Vaſquez* ſaith, *That if theſe words may be underſtood of Baptiſm, none can infer from them the Neceſſity of Auricular Confeſſion.* But *Gregory de Valentia* evidently proves, that this place doth relate to Remiſſion of Sins in Baptiſm; not only from the Compariſon of Places, but from the Teſtimonies of S. *Cyprian*, S. *Ambroſe*, and others.

John 20. 23. S. Mat. 28. 19. Mark 16. 16. *Janſen. Concord Evang. c.* 147. *Cajetan. in loc. Ed. Paris* 1540. *Catharin. in Cajetan. l.* 5. *p.* 444. Vaſquez. *in* 3 *Part. Th. Tom.* 4. *Qu.* 90. *Art.* 1. *Dub.* 2. *Num.* 2. Greg. de Valent. *in Thom. Tom.* 4. *Diſp.* 7. *Qu.* 9. *Punct.* 2. *p.* 284.

3. That it is expreſſed in the ſame *Anathemas* that this hath been always the Doctrine and Practice of the Catholick Church from the beginning. We do not deny the ancient practice, either of *Canonical Confeſſion*, as part of the Diſcipline of the Church for publick Offences; nor of *Voluntary Confeſſion*, for eaſe and ſatisfaction of the perplexed Minds of doubting or dejected Penitents; but that which we ſay was not owned nor practiſed by the Church from the Beginning, was this Sacramental Confeſſion as neceſſary to the Remiſſion of Sins before God. It is therefore to no purpoſe to produce out of *Bellarmine*, and others, a great number of Citations, to prove that which we never deny; but if they hold to the Council of *Trent*, they muſt prove from the Fathers,

thers, that Sins after Baptism cannot be forgiven without Confession to Men: which those who consider what they do, will never undertake, there being so many Testimonies of undoubted Antiquity against it. And it is observable, that *Bonaventure* grants, that before the *Lateran* Decree of *Innocentius* 3. it was no Heresy to deny the Necessity of Confession; and so he excuses those who in the time of *Lombard* and *Gratian*, held that Opinion. And all other Christians in the World besides those of the Church of *Rome*, do to this day reject the Necessity of Particular Confession to a Priest, in order to Remission, as the Writers of the Church of *Rome* themselves confess. So *Godignus* doth of the *Abyssins*; *Philippus à SS. Trinitate*, of the *Jacobites*; *Clemens Galanius* of the *Nestorians*, who saith, *They made a Decree against the use of Confession to any but to God alone.* And *Alexius Menezes* of the Christians of S. *Thomas* in the *Indies*. The Greeks believe Confession only to be of Positive and Ecclesiastical Institution, as the late Author of the *Critical History of the Faith and Customs of the Eastern Nations*, proves. And the very Form of their Absolution declares, that they do not think particular Confession of all known Sins, necessary to Pardon: for therein the Priest absolves the Penitent from *the Sins he hath not confessed through forgetfulness, or shame.* And now let any one prove this to have been a Catholick Tradition by *Vincentius* his Rules, *viz. That it hath been always received, every where, and by All.*

Bonavent. *in l. 4. Sent. Dist. 17. part 2*

Godign. *de rebus Abyss. l. 1. c. 28.*

*Itinerarium Orientale. l. 5. c. 8.*

Galan. *Concil. Eccles. Armenæ. Tom. 2. p. 605.*

*Histoire Critiq; de la Creance & de Coutums des Nations du Levant. c. 8. p. 105.*

*Ch. 1. pap. 14. Resp. 1.*

*Jerem. Patriarch. ad Theolog. Wirtemberg. p. 87.*

*Arcud. de Concord. Ecclesiæ Occident. & Orient. in 7 Sacram. l. 4. c. 3.*

## VIII. *Of Indulgences.*

1. THey must be extreamly ignorant, who take the Power of Indulgences, to be *a Leave from the Pope to commit what Sins they please*; *and that by virtue thereof, they shall escape Punishment for their Sins, without Repentance, in another World.* Yet this is the sense of the Misrepresentation, which, he saith, is made of it. And if he saith true in his Preface, *That he hath described the Belief of a Papist, exactly according to the apprehension he had when he was a Protestant:* He shews how well he understood the Matters in difference, when I think no other Person besides himself ever had such an apprehension of it, who pretended to be any thing like a Scholar.

Goar *in Eucholog. p. 681.*

Pag. 15, 16.

2. *But now he believes it damnable to hold that the Pope, or any other Power in Heaven or Earth, can give him leave to commit any Sins whatsoever*; *or that for any Sum of Mony, he can obtain any Indulgence, or Pardon for Sins that are to be committed by him, or his Heirs hereafter.* Very well! But what thinks he of obtaining an Indulgence, or Pardon, after they are committed? Is no such thing to be obtained in the Court of *Rome* for a Sum of Mony? He cannot but have heard of the *Tax* of the *Apostolick Chamber for several Sins*, and what Sums are there set upon them. Why did he not as freely speak against this? This is published in the vast *Collection* of *Tracts* of *Canon Law*, set forth by the *Pope's Authority*, where there are certain Rates for Perjury, Murder, Apostacy, *&c.* Now what do these *Sums* of Mony mean? If they be small, it is so much the better Bargain, for the Sins are very great. And *Espencæus* complains, *that this Book was so far from being called in, that*, he saith, *the Pope's Legats renewed those Faculties and confirmed them.* It seems then a Sum of Mony may be of some consequence to-

*Tractat: Tractatuum To. 15. part 1. f. 368.*

Espencæ. *in Ep. ad Tit. c. 1. digress. 2.*

wards

wards the obtaining Pardon for a Sin paſt, tho' not for a Licenſe to commit it. But what mighty difference is there, whether a Man procures with Mony a *Diſpenſation*, or a *Pardon?* For the Sin can hurt him no more, than if he had Licenſe to commit it.

3. *He doth believe there is a Power in the Church to grant Indulgences*; *which*, he ſaith, *concern not at all the Remiſſion of Sins, either Mortal or Venial, but only of ſome Temporal Puniſhments remaining due after the Guilt is remitted.* Here now ariſes a Material Queſtion, *viz.* Whether the *Popes*, or the *Repreſenter*, be rather to be believed. If the Popes, who grant the Indulgences are to be believed; then not only the bare Remiſſion of Sins is concerned in them, but *the Plenary*, and *moſt Plenary Remiſſion of Sins* is to be had by them. So *Boniface* the Eighth, in his Bull of *Jubilee* granted, *Non ſolum plenam & largiorem, imo pleniſſimam veniam peccatorum.* If theſe words had no relation to remiſſion of Sins, the People were horribly cheated by the ſound of them. In the Bull of *Clement* the VIth, not extant in the *Bullarium*, but publiſhed aut of the *Utrecht* Manuſcript, not only a Plenary Abſolution from all Sins is declared to all Perſons who died in the Way to *Rome*; but he commands the Angels of Paradiſe to carry the Soul immediately to Heaven. And I ſuppoſe, whatever implies ſuch an Abſolution as carries a Soul to Heaven, doth concern Remiſſion of Sins. *Boniface* the IXth, granted Indulgences, *à Pœnâ & à Culpâ*; and thoſe certainly concerned Remiſſion of Sins; being not barely from the Temporal Puniſhment, but from the Guilt it ſelf. *Clement* the VIIIth, whom *Bellarmine* magnifies for his care in reforming Indulgences, in his Bull of *Jubilee*, grants a *moſt Plenary Remiſſion of Sins*; and *Urban* the VIIIth, ſince him, not only a Relaxation of Penances, but *Remiſſion of Sins*; and ſo lately as *A. D.* 1671. *Clement* the Xth, publiſhed an Indulgence upon the Canonization of five new Saints, wherein he not only grants a Plenary Indulgence of Sins, but upon invocation of one of theſe Saints *in the Point of Death, a Plenary Indulgence of all his Sins.* And what doth this ſignifie *in the Point of Death*, if it do not concern the Remiſſion of Sins?

*Bullar. Cherubin. in To. 1. p. 204.*

*Prorſus mandamus Angelis Paradiſi, quantum animamillius à Purgatorio penitùs abſolutam in Paradiſi gloriam introducant. Bulla Clem. 6. ultrajecti A.D. 1653.*

*Gobel. Perſon. Coſmoder. at. 6. c. 86. p. 278. Bullar. To. 3. p. 74. To. 4. p. 86.*

4. *Indulgences*, he ſaith, *are nothing elſe but a Mitigation or Relaxation, upon juſt Cauſes, of Canonical Penances, which are or may be enjoined by the Paſtors of the Church on penitent Sinners, according to their ſeveral degrees of Demerits.* If by Canonical Penances, they mean thoſe enjoined by the Penitential Canons, *Greg. de Valentia* ſaith; *This Opinion differs not from that of the Hereticks, and makes Indulgences to be uſeleſs and dangerous things. Bellarmine* brings ſeveral Arguments againſt this Doctrine. (1.) *There would be no need of the Treaſure of the Church*; *which he had proved to be the Foundation of Indulgences.* (2.) *They would be rather hurtful than profitable, and the Church would deceive her Children by them.* (3.) *They could not be granted for the Dead.* (4.) *They who receive Indulgences, do undergo Canonical Penances.* (5.) *The Form of them doth expreſs, that they do relate to God, and not only to the Church.* And this, I think, is ſufficient to ſhew how far he is from true Repreſenting the Nature of Indulgences; for we do not diſpute the Church's Power in relaxing Canonical Penances to Penitent Sinners upon juſt Cauſes

Greg. de Valent. *de Indulg. c. 2.* Bell. *de Indulg. l. 1. c. 7. C. 2.*

IX. *Of*

## IX. *Of Satisfaction.*

1. *HE believes it damnable to think any thing injuriouſly of Chriſt's Paſſion:* But then he diſtinguiſhes *the Eternal and Temporal Pain due to Sin. As to the Guilt and Eternal Pain, the Satisfaction*, he ſaith, *is proper to Chriſt; but as to the Temporal Pain, which may remain due by God's Juſtice, after the other are remitted*, he ſaith, *that Penitent Sinners may in ſome meaſure ſatisfie for that by Prayer, Faſting, Alms, &c.* p. 17.

2. *Theſe Penitential Works*, he ſaith, *are no otherwiſe ſatisfactory, than as joined and applied to Chriſt's Satisfaction, in virtue of which alone our good Works find a grateful acceptance in God's ſight*, p. 19.

But for right apprehending the State of the Controverſie, we muſt conſider.

1. That they grant both Eternal and Temporal Pain due to Sin, to be remitted in Baptiſm; ſo that all the Satisfaction to be made, is for Sins committed after Baptiſm.

2. We diſtinguiſh between Satisfaction to the Church before Abſolution, and Satisfaction to the Juſtice of God for ſome part of the puniſhment to Sin which is unremitted.

3. We do not deny that truly Penitential Works are pleaſing to God, ſo as to avert his Diſpleaſure; but we deny that there can be *any Compenſation in way of equivalency*, between what we ſuffer, and what we deſerve. *Catech. Roman. part. 2. c. 5. n. 52, 56.*

The Matter in Controverſie therefore on this Head, conſiſts in theſe things.

1. That after the total Remiſſion of Sins in Baptiſm, they ſuppoſe a Temporal Puniſhment to remain, when the Eternal is forgiven; which the Penitent is to ſatisfie God's Juſtice for: and without this being done in this Life, he muſt go into Purgatory for that End. Of which more under that Head.

2. That this Satisfaction may be made to the Juſtice of God, after Abſolution is given by the Prieſt. So that altho' the Penitent be admitted into God's Favour, by the Power of the Keys, according to their own Doctrine; yet the Application of the Merits of Chriſt, together with the Saints in the Sentence of Abſolution (according to their Form) do not ſet him ſo free, but he either wants a new ſupply from the Treaſure of the Church, *i. e.* from the ſame Merits of Chriſt and the Saints; or elſe he is to ſatisfie for the Temporal Puniſhment by his own Penances.

3. That theſe Penitential Works are to be joined with the Merits of Chriſt, in the way of proper Satisfaction to Divine Juſtice. And however ſoftly this may be expreſſed; the meaning is, that Chriſt hath merited, that we may merit, and by his Satisfaction, we are enabled to ſatisfy for our ſelves. And if the Satisfaction by way of Juſtice be taken away, the other will be a Controverſie about Words.

4. That theſe Penitential Works may not only be ſufficient for themſelves, but they may be ſo over-done, that a great ſhare may be taken from them to make up the Treaſure of the Church, for the benefit of others who fall ſhort, when they are duly applied to them in the way of Indul- *Catech. Rom. de Pœnit. Sacr. n. 61.*

Indulgences. And about these Points, we must desire greater Proof than we have ever yet seen.

## X. *Of reading the Holy Scripture.*

Pag. 19. 1. *HE believes it damnable in any one, to think, speak, or do any thing irreverently towards the Scripture, or by any means whatsoever to bring it into disrepute or disgrace:* but not being contented with this, he adds, *That he holds it in the highest Veneration of all Men living.* Now, here we must desire a little better Representation of this Matter. For certainly, those who derive its Authority from the Church; who set Traditions in equal esteem with it; who complain so much of its Obscurity, can never be said to hold it in equal Veneration with those who maintain its independent Authority, its Sufficiency, and Perspicuity. And these are known and material Points in Controversie between us and them: therefore let them not say, they hold it in the highest Veneration of all Men living; tho' those thought themselves through Catholicks, who have compared it to a *Nose of Wax*, *to a* Lesbian *Rule*, *to a dead Letter*, *unsensed Characters*, and to other things, not fit to be repeated. But we are well pleased to find them express such Veneration for it. Wherefore then are the People to be kept from reading it?

2. He saith, *It is not out of disrespect to it.* But why then? (1.) *Because private Interpretation is not proper for the Scripture*, 2 Pet. 1. 20. One would think the Scripture were not kept *only* from the People, by such a sense being put upon it; for any one that would but consider that place, will find it must relate to the Prophets themselves; and doth he think the Prophets were to be debarr'd from reading the Scriptures? But this is playing with Scripture, and not reasoning from it. (2.) *Because in the Epistles of St.* Paul *are certain things hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable deprave, as also the rest of the Scriptures, to their own perdition*, 2 Pet. 3. 16. Now in my Opinion, such Men deserve more to be debarr'd from medling with the Scripture, who make such perverse Inferences from it, than ordinary Readers. And if they use all other places as they do this, they cannot be excused from *depraving it.* It is granted, there were then *unlearned and unstable Men*, who misunderstood, or misapplied the Writings of St. *Paul*, and other Scriptures. And what then? There are Men of all Ages, who abuse the best things in the World, even the Gospel it self, and the Grace of God. Doth it hence follow, that the Gospel must not be preached to them, or the Grace of God made known to them, for fear of Mens making ill use of it? If this had been the just Consequence, would not St. *Peter* himself have thought of this? But he was so far from making it, that he adviseth those Persons he writes to, to have a mighty regard to the Scriptures, even to the Prophetical Writings, *as to a Light shining in a dark place*, 1 Pet. 1. 19. According to this way of deducing Consequences, St. *Peter* should have argued just contrary; *The Prophetical Writings are dark and obscure, therefore meddle not with them, but trust your Guides:* Whereas the Apostle, after he had told them what the Apostles saw and heard, he adds, *That they have a more sure Prophetical Word*, as the Rhemists translate it. How could that be *more sure* to them, unless

unleſs they were allowed to read, conſider, and make uſe of it? (3.) *Becauſe God hath given only ſome to be Apoſtles, ſome Prophets, other ſome Evangeliſts, and other ſome Paſtors and Doctors*, Eph. 4. 11. Doth it hence follow that the People are not to read the Scriptures? In the Univerſities, Tutors are appointed to interpret *Ariſtotle* to their Pupils; doth it hence follow that they are not to read *Ariſtotle* themſelves; it is, no doubt, a mighty Advantage to have ſuch Infallible Interpreters as the *Apoſtles* and *Prophets*; and all Chriſtians are bound to follow their Senſe, where they have delivered it. But ſuppoſe the Queſtion be about the Senſe of theſe Interpreters; muſt their Books not be looked into, becauſe of the danger of Error? This Reaſon will ſtill hold againſt thoſe who go about to deliver their Senſe; and ſo on, till by this Method of Reaſoning, all ſorts of Books and Interpretatious be rejected; unleſs any ſuch can be found out, which is not liable to be abuſed or miſunderſtood. And if there be any ſuch to be had, they are much to blame who do not diſcover it. But as yet we ſee no Remedy for two things in Mankind, a proneneſs to Sin, and to Miſtake. But of all things, we ought not to take away from them one of the beſt Means to prevent both, *viz.* a diligent, and careful, and humble reading the Holy Scriptures.

But, 3. He denies *that all Perſons are forbid to read the Scriptures, but only ſuch as have no Licenſe, and good Teſtimony from their Curats: and therefore their deſign is not to preſerve Ignorance in the People, but to prevent a blind ignorant preſumption.* Pag. 21.

Theſe are plauſible Pretences to ſuch as ſearch no farther; but the Myſtery of this Matter lies much deeper. It was, no doubt, the Deſign of the Church of *Rome* to keep the Bible wholly out of the hands of the People. But upon the Reformation they found it impoſſible; ſo many Tranſlations being made into vulgar Languages; and therefore care was taken to have Tranſlations made by ſome of their own Body; and ſince the People of better inclinations to Piety were not to be ſatisfied without the Bible; therefore they thought it the better way to permit certain Perſons whom they could truſt, to have a Licenſe to read it: And this was the true Reaſon of the Fourth Rule of the *Index Liber prohibit*, made in purſuance of the Order of the Council of *Trent*, and publiſhed by *Pius* IV. by which any one may ſee it was not an Original Permiſſion out of any good Will to the Thing; but an aftergame to get the Bible out of the Hands of the people again: And therefore Abſolution was to be denied to thoſe who would not deliver them to their Ordinaries when they were called for: And the Regulars themſelves were not to be permitted to have Bibles without a Licenſe: And as far as I can underſtand the Addition of *Clement* VIII. to that Fourth Rule, he withdraws any new Power of granting ſuch Licenſes; and ſaith they are contray to the *Command and Uſage of that Church, which*, he ſaith, *is to be inviolably obſerved:* wherein I think he declares himſelf fully againſt ſuch Licenſes: And that Inferior Guides ſhould grant them againſt the Command of the Head of the Church, is a thing not very agreeable to the Unity and Subordination they boaſt of.

*Quod quidem inviolatè ſervandum eſt.* Clem. VIII. *ad Reg. 4. Indicit Roman.*

## XI. *Of Apocryphal Books.*

Pag. 21. WE do not charge the Church of *Rome* with *making what Additions to Scripture they think good*, as the *Misrepresenter* saith; but we charge them with taking into the Canon of Scripture such Books as were not received for Canonical by the Christian Church; as those Books himself mentions, *viz. Toby*, *Judith*, *Ecclesiasticus*, *Wisdom*, and *Maccabees*.

*Concil. Trident. Sess.* 4. 8. *Apr. de Canon. Script.* 2. We do not only charge them with this, but with Anathematizing all those who do not upon this Declaration believe them to be Canonical; since they cannot but know, that these Books never were in the *Jewish* Canon, and were left out by many Christian Writers. And if the Church cannot add to the Scripture, and our Author *thinks it damnable to do it*; how can it make any Books *Canonical*, which were not so received by the Church? For the *Scripture* in this sense is the *Canon*; and therefore if it add to the *Canon*, it adds to the Scripture; *i. e.* it makes it necessary to believe some Books to be of infallible Authority, which were not believed to be so, either by the *Jewish* or Christian Church, as appears by abundant Testimonies to that purpose produced by a Learned Bishop of this Church; which ought to have been considered by the *Representer*, that he might not have talked so crudely about this Matter.

Bp. *Cosin's* Scholastical History of the Canon of Scripture.

But however, I must consider what he saith;

*Greg. Nazianzen. in Carmin.* 2 *vol. p.* 98. *Orat. de Maccab. vol.* 1. *p.* 398. 1. He produces the Testimonies of *Greg. Nazianzen*, who is expressly against him, and declares but Twenty two Books in the Canon of the Old Testament; but how doth he prove that he thought these Books Canonical? He quotes his *Oration on the Maccabees*; where I can find nothing like it; and instead of it he expressly follows, as he declares, the Book of *Josephus*, of *the Authority of Reason* concerning them. So that if this proves any thing, it proves *Josephus* his Book Canonical, and not the *Maccabees*.

*Ambros. de Jacob. & Vitæ Erat. l.* 2. *c.* 10, 11, 12. *Cocci. Thes. Cathol. l.* 6. *Act.* 18. *Scholastical History, n.* 83. 2. He adds the Testimony of St. *Ambrose*, who in the place he refers to, enlarges on the Story of the *Maccabees*, but saith nothing of the Authority of the Book. And even *Coccius* himself grants, that of old *Melito Sardensis*, *Amphilochius*, *Greg. Nazianzen*, the Council of *Laodicea*, St. *Hierom*, *Ruffinus*, and *Gregory* the Great, did not own the Book of *Maccabees* for Canonical.

*Euseb. l.* 5. *c.* 24. *Orig. Pref. in Psal. Athan. in Synopsi. Hilar. Pref. in Psal. S. Cyril. Catech.* 4. *Epiph. hær.* 8. 76. *Basil. Philocal. c.* 3. *Amphil. Epist. Canon. ad Seleuc. Chrys. Hom.* 4. *in Gen. Scholast. Hist. n* 71. 3. *Innocentius ad Exuperium* speaks more to his purpose. And if that Decretal Epistle be allowed, against which Bishop *Cosins* hath made considerable Objections; then it must be granted, that these Books were then in the *Roman* Canon: but that they were not received by the Universal Church, appears evidently by the Canon of the Council of *Laodicea*, *c.* 60. wherein these Books are left out; and this was received in the Code of the Universal Church; which was as clear a Proof of the Canon then generally received, as can be expected. It is true, the Council of *Carthage* took them in; and St. *Augustine* seems to be of the same Opinion: But on the other side, they are left out by *Melito* Bishop of *Sardis*, who lived near the Apostles times, *Origen*, *Athanasius*, S. *Hilary*, St. *Cyril* of *Jerusalem*, *Epiphanius*, St. *Basil*, *Amphilochius*, St. *Chrysostom*, and especially St. *Jerom*, who hath laboured in this point so much, that no fewer than thirteen places are produced out of him to this purpose, by the fore-mentioned Learned Bishop of our Church, who clearly proves there was no Tradition for the Canon of the Council of *Trent* in any one Age of the Christian Church. But our Author goes on.

4. *It*

4. *It is of little concern to him, whether these Books were ever in the Hebrew Copy.* I would only ask whether it be of any concern to him, whether they were divinely inspired or not? He saith, *It is damnable to add to the Scripture:* by the Scripture we mean Books written by Divine Inspiration. Can the Church make Books to be so written, which were not so written? If not, then all it hath to do, is to deliver by Tradition what was so, and what not. Whence should they have this Tradition, but from the *Jews?* and they owned no Divine Inspiration after the time of *Malachy*. How then should there be any Books so written after that time? And he that saith in this Matter, as he doth, *It is of little concern to him whether they were in the Hebrew Canon*, doth little concern himself what he ought to believe, and what not, in this matter. P. 22.

5. *Since the Churches Declaration*, he saith, *no Catholicks ever doubted.* What doth he mean by the Church's Declaration, that of *Innocent*, and the Council of *Carthage?* Then the same Bishop hath shewed him, that since that time, there have been very many, both in the *Greek* and *Latin* Church, of another Opinion. And a little before the Council of *Trent*, *Catharinus* saith, *That a Friend of his, and a Brother in Christ, derided him as one that wanted Learning, for daring to assert these Books were within the Canon of Scripture*; and it is plain, *Cardinal Cajetan* could never be perswaded of it: But if he means since the Council of *Trent*, then we are returned to our Difficulty, how such a Council can make any Books Canonical, which were not received for such by the Catholick Church before? For then they do not declare the Canon, but create it. P. 23. *Cathar. Adver. Cajet. p. 48. ed. Paris 1535.*

## XII. *Of the Vulgar Edition of the Bible.*

1. WE do not dispute about the *Vulgar Edition*, whether it may not be preferr'd before modern *Latin Editions*, because of its great *Antiquity* in some parts of it, and its general Reception since the time of *Greg.* I. But our dispute is, Whether it be made so authentick since the Council of *Trent*, that no Appeals are to be made to the Originals, *i. e.* Whether that Council by its Authority could make a Version equal to the Originals out of which it was made? Especially since at the time of that Decree, the *Vulgar Edition* was confessed to be full of Errors and Corruptions by *Sixtus* V. who saith he took infinite pains to correct them, and yet left very many behind, as appeared by *Clement* VIII. who corrected his *Bibles* in very many places, and grants some faults were left uncorrected still. Now, how was it possible for the Council of *Trent* to declare that Edition Authentick, which was afterwards so much corrected? And, whether was the correct Edition of *Sixtus* V. *Authentick* or not, being made in pursuance of the Decree of the Council? If not, how comes *Clement* his Edition to be made Authentick, when the other was not, since there may be Corruptions found in that, as well as the other; and no one can tell, but it may be reviewed and corrected still; as some of their own Writers confess *it stands in need of it?* P. 24, 25. *In hac Vulgata Editione visa sunt non nulla mutanda, quæ consulto mutata non sunt.* Clem. VIII. *in Bullâ.* Luc. Burgens. *in variis Lect.*

2. Our Controversy is not so much about the Authority of the Vulgar *Latin*, above other *Latin* Versions to those who understand them; but Nat. Alex. and. *dissert. de vulg. vers. quæst. 6*

but whether none elſe but the Latin Verſion muſt be uſed by thoſe who
P. 26. underſtand it not? And here our *Repreſenter* ſaith, that *he is commanded not to read any of theſe Tranſlations*, (ſpeaking of *Tindals*, and that in Queen *Elizabeth*'s time) *but only that which is recommended to him by the Church.* If this relate to the *Vulgar Latin*, then we are to ſeek, why the Common People ſhould have none to read, but what they cannot underſtand; if to *Tranſlations of their own*, then we doubt not to make it appear, that our Tranſlation allowed amongſt us, is more exact and agreeable than any they can put into their hands.

## XIII. *Of the Scripture as a Rule of Faith.*

P. 27. THE only thing inſiſted on here, is, *That it is not the words, but the ſenſe of Scripture is the Rule; and that this ſenſe is not to be taken from Mens private Fancies, which are various and uncertain; and therefore where there is no ſecurity from Errors, there is nothing capable of being a Rule.*

To clear this, we muſt conſider,

1. That it is not neceſſary to the making of a Rule, to prevent any poſſibility of miſtake, but that it be ſuch that they cannot miſtake without their own fault. For Certainty in it ſelf, and Sufficiency for the uſe of others, are all the neceſſary Properties of a Rule; but after all, it's poſſible for Men not to apply the Rule aright, and then They are to be blamed, and not the Rule.

2. If no Men can be certain of the right Senſe of Scripture, then it is not plain in neceſſary things; which is contrary to the deſign of it, and to the cleareſt Teſtimonies of Antiquity, and to the common ſenſe of all Chriſtians, who never doubted or diſputed the Senſe of ſome things revealed therein; as the Unity of the Godhead, the making of the World by him, the Deluge, the Hiſtory of the Patriarchs, the Captivity of the *Jews*, the coming of the Meſſias, his ſending his Apoſtles, his coming again to Judgment, *&c.* No Man who reads ſuch things in Scripture, can have any doubt about the ſenſe and meaning of the Words,

3. Where the Senſe is dubious, we do not allow any Man to put what Senſe he pleaſes upon them; but we ſay, there are certain means, whereby he may either attain to the true Senſe, or not be damned if he do not. And the firſt thing every Man is to regard, is not his ſecurity from being deceived, but from being damned. For Truth is made known in order to Salvation: If therefore I am ſure to attain the chief end, I am not ſo much concerned, as to the poſſibility of Errors, as that I be not deceived by my own fault. We do not therefore leave Men *either to follow their own fancy, or to interpret Scripture by it*; but we ſay, They are bound upon pain of Damnation to ſeek the Truth ſincerely, and to uſe the beſt means in order to it; and if they do this, they either will not err, or their Errors will not be their Crime.

## XIV. *Of the Interpretation of Scripture.*

1. THE Queſtion is not, Whether Men are not bound to make uſe of the beſt means for the right Interpretation of Scripture, by Reading, Meditation, Prayer, Advice, a humble and teachable Temper, *&c. i. e.* all the proper means fit for ſuch an end? but whether after all theſe, there be a neceſſity of ſubmitting to ſome Infallible Judge, in order to the attaining the certain Senſe of Scripture?

2. The Queſtion is not, Whether we ought not to have a mighty regard to the Senſe of the whole Chriſtian Church in all Ages ſince the Apoſtles, which we profeſs to have? but, Whether the *preſent Roman Church*, as it ſtands divided from other Communions, hath ſuch a Right and Authority to interpret Scripture, that we are bound to believe that to be the Infallible Senſe of Scripture which ſhe delivers?

And here I cannot but take notice how ſtrangely this matter is here miſrepreſented: for the Caſe is put,

1. *As if every one who rejects their pretence of Infallibility, had nothing to guide him but his own private Fancy in the Interpretation of Scripture.* P. 29.

2. *As if we rejected the Senſe put upon Scripture by the whole Community of Chriſtians in all Ages ſince the Apoſtles times.* Whereas we appeal in the matters in difference between us, to this univerſal Senſe of the Chriſtian Church, and are verily perſuaded they cannot make it out in any one Point wherein we differ from them. And themſelves cannot deny, that in ſeveral we have plainly the conſent of the firſt Ages, as far as appears by the Books remaining, on our ſide; as in the Worſhip of Images, Invocation of Saints, Papal Supremacy, Communion in both kinds, Prayer and Scripture in known Tongues; and I may ſafely add, the Sufficiency of the Scripture, Tranſubſtantiation, Auricular Confeſſion, Publick Communions, Solitary Maſſes, to name no more.

But here lies the Artifice; We muſt not pretend to be capable of judging either of Scripture, or Tradition; but we muſt truſt their Judgment what is the ſenſe of Scripture, and what hath been the Practice of the Church in all Ages, although their own Writers confeſs the contrary: which is very hard.

But he ſeems to argue for ſuch a ſubmiſſion to the Church; 1. *Becauſe we receive the Book of Scripture from her; therefore from her we are to receive the ſenſe of the Book.* P. 29. An admirable Argument! We receive the *Old Teſtament* from the *Jews*; therefore from them we are to receive the ſenſe of the *Old Teſtament*, and ſo we are to reject the true *Meſſias*. But this is not all: If by the Church, they mean the Church of *Rome* in diſtinction from others, we deny it: If they mean the whole Chriſtian Church, we grant it; but then the force of it is quite loſt. But why is it not poſſible for the Church of *Rome* to keep theſe Writings, and deliver them to others, which make againſt her ſelf? Do not Perſons in Law-Suits often produce Deeds which make againſt them? But there is yet a farther Reaſon; it was not poſſible for the Church of *Rome* to make away theſe Writings, being ſo univerſally ſpread.

2. *Becauſe the Church puts the difference between true and falſe Books, therefore that muſt be truſted for the true ſenſe of them.* Which is juſt as if one ſhould argue, The Clerks of the Rolls are to give an account

to the Court of true Records, therefore they are to ſit on the Bench, and to give Judgment in all Cauſes. The Church is only to declare what it finds as to Canonical Books; but hath no Power to make any Book Canonical which was not before received for ſuch. But I confeſs *Stapleton* faith, the Church if it pleaſe may make *Hermas* his *Paſtor*, and *Clemens* his *Conſtitutions* Canonical: but I do not think our Author will therein follow him.

Controv. 5. Qu. 4. art. 2.

## XV. *Of Tradition.*

P. 30, 31. 1. THE Queſtion is not about *Human Traditions ſupplying the Defects of Scripture*, as he miſrepreſents it; but whether there be an unwritten Word, which we are equally bound to receive with the Written Word: Although theſe things which paſs under that Name, are really but *Human Traditions*; yet we do not deny that they pretend them to be of Divine Original.

2 Theſſ. 2. 13. 2. We do not deny, but the *Apoſtles might deliver ſuch things by Word as well as by Epiſtle, which their Diſciples were bound to believe and keep:* but we think there is ſome difference to be made between what we certainly know they delivered in Writing, and what it is now impoſſible for us to know; *viz.* what they delivered by word without writing.

P. 31. 3. We ſee no ground why any one ſhould believe any Doctrine *with a ſtedfaſt and Divine Faith*, which is not bottom'd on the Written Word; for then his Faith muſt be built on the Teſtimony of the Church as Divine and Infallible, or elſe his Faith cannot be Divine. But it is impoſſible to prove it to be Divine and Infallible, but by the Written Word; and therefore, as it is not reaſonable that he ſhould believe the Written Word by ſuch a Divine Teſtimony of the Church; ſo if any particular Doctrine may be received on the Authority of the Church without the Written Word, then all Articles of Faith may, and ſo there would be no need of the Written Word.

P. 32. 4. *The Faith of Chriſtians doth no otherwiſe ſtand upon the Foundation of the Church's Tradition*, than as it delivers down to us the Books of Scripture; but we acknowledge the general Senſe of the Chriſtian Church to be a very great help for underſtanding the true ſenſe of Scripture; and we do not reject any thing ſo delivered; but what is all this to the Church of *Rome?* But this is ſtill the way of true Repreſenting.

## XVI. *Of Councils.*

P. 33. 1. WE are glad to find ſo good a Reſolution as ſeems to be expreſſed in theſe words, viz. *That he is obliged to believe nothing beſides that which Chriſt taught, and his Apoſtles; and if any thing contrary to this ſhould be defined, and commanded to be believed, even by Ten Thouſand Councils, he believes it damnable in any one to receive it, and by ſuch Decrees to make Additions to his Creed.* This ſeems to be a very good ſaying, and it is pity any thing elſe ſhould overthrow it. But here lies the Miſrepreſenting; he will believe what Chriſt and his Apoſtles taught, from the Definitions of Councils, and ſo all this goodly

Fabrick falls to nothing; for it is but as if one ſhould ſay, If *Ariſtotle* ſhould falſly deliver *Plato*'s ſenſe, I will never believe him, but I am reſolved to take *Plato*'s ſenſe only from *Ariſtotle*'s words. So here, he firſt declares he will take the Faith of Chriſt from the Church; and then he ſaith, if the Church Repreſentative ſhould contradict the Faith of Chriſt, he would never believe it.

2. We diſpute not with them, the Right and Neceſſity of *General Councils*, (upon great occaſions) if they be truly ſo, rightfully called, lawfully aſſembled, and fairly managed; which have been, and may be of great uſe to the Chriſtian World, for ſetling the Faith, healing the Breaches of Chriſtendom, and reforming Abuſes. And we farther ſay, that the Decrees of ſuch Councils ought to be ſubmitted to, where they proceed upon certain Grounds of Faith, and not upon unwritten Traditions; Which was the fatal ſtumbling at the Threſhold in the Council of *Trent*, and was not to be recovered afterwards; for their ſetting up Traditions equally with the Written Word, made it eaſie for them to define, and as eaſie for all others to reject their Definitions, in caſe there had not been ſo many other Objections againſt the Proceedings of that Council. And ſo all our Diſpute concerning this matter is taken off from the general Notion, and runs into the particular Debate concerning the Qualifications and Proceedings of ſome which were called Free, General Councils, but were neither *General*, nor *Free*; *P.* 33. and therefore *could not deliver the ſenſe of the Catholick Church*, which our Author requires them to do.

## XVII. *Of Infallibility in the Church.*

1. HE doth not pretend this belongs *to the Paſtors and Prelates of his Church, who may fall*, he ſaith, *into Hereſie and Schiſm*; *but that the whole Church is ſecured by Divine Promiſes from all Error and Danger of Prevarication*; which he proves from *the Promiſes of the New Teſtament*, *Mat.* 16. 18. —— 28. 20. *John* 14. 16, 26. But however the former ſeems to take away Infallibility from the Guides of the Church, yet that this is to be underſtood of them *ſeparately*, appears by what follows. *P.* 36.

2. *The like Aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt he believes to be in all General Councils, which is the Church Repreſentative; by which they are ſpecially protected from all Error in all definitions and declarations in matters of Faith.* *P.* 38.

Now here are two ſorts of Infallibility tacked to one another by vertue of theſe general Promiſes, which ought more diſtinctly to be conſidered.

1. To preſerve Chriſt's Church ſo as it ſhall never ceaſe to be a Church, is one thing; to preſerve it from all Error is another: The former anſwers the End of Chriſt's Promiſes, as to the *Duration* of the *Church*; and the latter is not implied in them.

2. The promiſe of *teaching them all Truth*, John 16. 13. is not made to the whole Church, but to the *Apoſtles*: And their caſe was ſo peculiar and extraordinary, that there can be no juſt inference from the aſſiſtance promiſed to them, of what the Church would enjoy in all Ages.

3. If the diffusive Church have no infallible Assistance promised, then no infallible Assistance can from thence be proved for the Church representative; so that some particular Promises to the Guides of the Church as assembled together, are necessary to prove the Infallibility of Councils.

Page 38. 4. It by no means proves following Councils to be infallible, because the Apostles said, *Acts* 15. 28. *It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us.* Our Author *doth not doubt, but the same may be prefixed to all determinations in point of Faith, resolved on by any General Council lawfully assembled since that time, or to be held to the world's end.* But what Reason he had for not doubting in this matter, I cannot see; *the Assistance*, he saith, *being to extend as far as the Promise:* But shall *Assistance* imply *Infallibility?* Then there must be good store, as long as the Promises of Divine Grace hold good: But this Assistance of Councils is very different from the Assistance of Grace, for the Church may subsist without Councils, but cannot without Grace: What General Council was there from the meeting, *Acts* 15. to the Council of *Nice?* Were not Christ's Promises fulfilled to his Church all that time, when it increased in all parts against the most violent Opposition?

5. No Parity of Reason from the *Jewish* Church can be sufficient Proof

Page 39. for Infallibility in the Christian. But our Author argues thus, *If God's special Assistance was never wanting to the Church of the Jews, so as to let it fail in the truth of its Doctrine, or its Authority: Why should not he believe the same of the Church of Christ, which is built on better Promises?* What special Assistance was it which *Israel* had, when it is said,

2 Chron. 15. 3. that *for a long time* Israel *had been without the true God, and without a teaching Priest, and without Law?* And as to *Judah*, was there no failing in point of Doctrine in our Saviour's time? It is true, they had the Law entire, and that was all that was good among them, for their Teachers had corrupted themselves and the People, and made the Law of no effect among them: If there were Infallibility any where, it must be in the High-Priest and *Sanhedrim*; but is it possible for any Christian to think them infallible, when they were so grosly mistaken about the main Article of their Faith as to the Messias, and pronounced him worthy of death? Is not this a fine Argument for the Infallibility of the Guides of the Christian Church? *But the Church of Christ hath better Promises:* No doubt of it, greater Promises of Grace and Mercy in this World, and in that to come: but what is all this to Infalliblity in Councils?

6. Christ's command of Obedience to those who sat in *Moses*'s Chair,

Page 39. (*Mat.* 23. 2.) doth not prove the Infallibility of those who sat there. Yet this is alledged to that purpose; and that men ought not to doubt of

*Chrysost.* in Mat. Hom. 72. *Hierom* in loc. *Caten. Gr.* in loc. *Hilar.* Ca. 24. *Theophylact* in loc. the reasonableness of the Commands of their Superiors. But St. *Chrysostom* saith, *our Saviour speaks of the things commanded by the Law of* Moses. *Per Cathedram Doctrinam Legis ostendit*, saith St. *Jerom: Not their own Doctrine, but that of* Moses, saith *Isidore*; and so *Hilary* and *Theophylact*. *Maldonate* confesseth, our Saviour's Words are to be understood, not of their own Doctrine, but of that of the Law; and therefore he yields the Obedience here required to be restrained to that; *All things*, saith *Cajetan*, *which they teach out of* Moses's *Chair: Not all their Doctrines, but as far as they were conformable to the Laws*, saith *Ferus*. Now can any one hence infer, that no men ought to dispute any Commands of Superiors, when it is supposed, that there is a Rule and Standard for them to speak according to; and our Saviour elsewhere doth suppose these very Men to teach things contrary to the Law, as in

the

the Case of *Corban*. Would our Saviour contradict himself, or require a blind Obedience in things repugnant to the Law? We do not deny a due submission to our Superiors in the Church; yea, we allow them a Power to determine things not forbidden; and think Obedience due in such things by vertue of their Authority; but yet this is far enough from Infallibility, or an unlimited implicit Obedience, which would overthrow the force of all our Saviour's Reasonings against the *Scribes* and *Pharisees*, as to their misinterpreting the Law, and the superstitious Practices they imposed upon the People. Mat. 15.

## XVIII. *Of the* POPE.

1. WE do not charge them with *believing the Pope to be God*; which it seems himself did, if we believe the *Misrepresenter* in his Preface; but there is some reason to doubt whether they do not at some times give him greater Honour than becomes a Man. I instance in the Adoration after his Election, when the new Pope is placed upon the Altar to receive the Submissions of the Cardinals; but the Altar, themselves do confess to be sacred to God alone: And there they profess to worship Jesus Christ, as present in the Host. This therefore looks too much like assuming the place of Christ, and not becoming the distance between God and Man. *Cerem.* §. 1. c. 2.

2. The Question is, *Whether Christ hath appointed the Pope or Bishop of* Rome *to be Pastor, Governour, and Head of his Church under him? This*, he saith, *he believes*, and this he knows we deny, and therefore had reason to expect some proof of it. But instead thereof he tells us *how they look on themselves as obliged to shew him the respect due to his Place*, which he knows is not the matter in question. Two things however he saith, which seem to justifie his Title. Page 40.

1. *He is the Successor of St.* Peter, *to whom Christ committed the care of his Flock.* But how far is this from proving the Pope to be Head of the Church under Christ? For how does it appear that Christ ever made St. *Peter* Head of the Church, or committed his Flock to him, in contradistinction to the rest of the Apostles? This is so far from being evident from Scripture, that the Learned Men of their Church are ashamed of the Places commonly produced for it; it being impossible ever to justifie the sense of them according to their own Rules of interpreting Scripture, *viz.* by the unanimous consent of the Fathers: *For*, 1. *Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock will I build my Church*, is interpreted by many of the Fathers, both *Greek and Latin, of* St. *Peter's* Confession, and not of his Person; so by S. *Chrysostom*, S. *Ambrose*, S. *Augustin*, S. *Basil* of *Seleucia*, S. *Hilary*, S. *Gregory Nyssen*, and *Theodoret*; all great and considerable Persons in the Christian Church, whose Words are plain and full to that purpose; and so they can never produce the unanimous consent of the Fathers for S. *Peter*'s Supremacy out of these words. 2. *And unto thee will I give the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven*, are interpreted by the Fathers, of S. *Peter* in common with the other Apostles; so * *Origen*, S. *Cyprian*, S. *Hilary*, S. *Hierom*, and S. *Augustin*, Page 41. Mat. 16. 18. *Chrysostom*, Hom. 1. in Pent. Tom. 5. ed. Savil, p. 979. *Ambrose*, de Incar. dom. Sacramento c. 5. *Augustin*, de verbis Dom. ad Evang. secun. Mar. Serm. 13. Tract. in Joh. 124. *Basil. Seleuc.* Orat. 25. ad fin. *Hilar.* de Trinit. l. 6. *Greg. Nyssen*, de Advent Domini cap. ult. *Theodoret* Epist. 77. 146. Mat. 16. 19.

* Orig. Comment. in Mat. Gr. Lat. p. 275. Cyprian. de Unit. Eccles. Hilar. de Trinit. l. 6. *Hier.* c. Jovin. l. 1. c. 14. in Mat. 16. *Aug.* in Joh. Tr. 118, 124. In Epist. Joh. To. 10.

Moyens ſurs & honneſtes, &c. p. 34, &c. Entretiens de Philaleth & Phileren. p. 121. Joh. Launoi. Ep. part 5. Reim. Formentino, & Part. 2. Ep. 5. P. 47, &c.

as they are all owned by ſome Members of the *Roman* Communion. And, 3. For theſe Words, *Feed my Sheep*, a late learned Doctor of the *Sorbon* ſhews, that if they prove any thing peculiar to S. *Peter*, they muſt prove him ſole Paſtor of the Church, which was the thing S. *Gregory* diſputed againſt ſo warmly. But that there was nothing peculiar to S. *Peter*, above or beyond the reſt of the Apoſtles, he ſhews at large from S. *Chryſoſtom*, S. *Cyril*, S. *Auguſtin*, and others, to whom I refer the Reader, and to the former Authors. But ſuppoſe it were made to appear, *That S.* Peter *was Head of the Church*, How doth the Biſhop of *Rome*'s Succeſſion in that Headſhip ſhew it ſelf? To that he ſaith 2. *That there hath been a viſible ſucceſſion of above Two hundred and fifty Biſhops, acknowledged as ſuch in all paſt Ages by the Chriſtian World. As ſuch:* What is that? As Biſhops of *Rome*. That is not of weight enough to put it upon tryal; as *Heads* of the *Catholick Church?* That he knows is not only denied by us, but by all the *Greek*, *Armenian*, *Neſtorian*, *Abyſſin* Churches; ſo that we dare ſay, it was never allowed in any one Age of the Chriſtian Church: but we need not inſiſt on the proof of this, ſince the late mentioned Authors of the *Roman* Communion have taken ſo great pains, not only to prove the Popes Supremacy to be an encroachment and uſurpation in the Church, but that the laying it aſide is neceſſary to the Peace and Unity of it. And until the Divine Inſtitution of the Papal Supremacy be proved, it is to no purpoſe to debate *what manner of Aſſiſtance is promiſed to the Pope in his Decrees.* Our Author is willing to decline the debate about his *perſonal Infallibility, as a matter of Opinion, and not of Faith*; and yet he ſaith, *he doubts not but God doth grant a ſpecial Aſſiſtance to the High-Prieſt, for the good of the whole Flock, under the New Law, as he did under the Old, and produces the Inſtance of* Caiaphas, *Joh.* 11. 51. This is a very ſurprizing way of reaſoning; for if his Arguments be good from Scripture, he muſt hold the Pope's *perſonal Infallibility as a matter of Faith*; and yet one would hardly think he ſhould build an Article of Faith on the inſtance of *Caiaphas:* For what conſequence can be drawn from God's overruling the mind of a very bad man, when he was carrying on a moſt wicked deſign, to utter ſuch words, which in the event proved true in another ſenſe than he meant them, that therefore God will give a ſpecial Aſſiſtance to the Pope in determining matters of Faith? Was not *Caiaphas* himſelf the man who propoſed the taking away the Life of Chriſt at that time? Was he aſſiſted in that Council? Did not he determine afterwards Chriſt to be guilty of blaſphemy, and therefore worthy of death? And is not this a rare Infallibility which is ſuppoſed to be conſiſtent with a Decree to crucifie Chriſt? And doth he in earneſt think ſuch Orders are to be obeyed, whether the ſupreme Paſtor be infallible or not? For ſo he concludes, *That his Sentence is to be obeyed, whether he be infallible or no.*

Page 42.

## XIX. *Of Diſpenſations.*

HERE the *Miſrepreſenter* ſaith, That a Papiſt believes that the Pope hath Authority to diſpenſe with the Laws of God, and abſolve any one from the Obligation of keeping the Commandments. On the other ſide, the *Repreſenter* affirms, *That the Pope has no Authority to diſpenſe with the Law of God; and that there's no power upon Earth*

*can absolve any one from the obligation of keeping the Commandments.* This matter is not to be determined by the ones affirming, and the others denying: but by finding out, if possible, the true sense of the Church of *Rome* about this matter. And there are Three Opinions about it.

1. Of those who assert, *That the Pope hath a Power of dispensing in any Divine Law, except the Articles of Faith.* The Gloss upon the Canon Law saith, That where the Text seems to imply, that the Pope cannot dispense against the Apostle, it is to be understood of Articles of Faith. And *Panormitan* saith, This Exposition pleases him well; for the Pope may dispense in all other things: *contra Apostolum dispensat*, saith the Gloss on the Decree: And the *Roman* Editors in the Margin, refer to 34. *Dist. c. Lector* to prove it: And there indeed the Gloss is very plain in the case, *sic ergo Papa dispensat contra Apostolum*: And the *Roman* Correctors there justifie it, and say it is no absurd Doctrine as to positive Institutions; but the former *notable Gloss*, as *Panormitan* calls it, sets down the particulars wherein the Pope may dispense. As 1. Against the Apostles and their Canons. 2. Against the *Old Testament.* 3. In Vows. 4. In Oaths. The *Summa Angelica* saith, the Pope may dispense as to all the Precepts of the *Old Testament.* And *Calvasius* founds this Power upon the plenitude of the Pope's Power, according to that Expression in the Decretal mentioned, that he can, *ex plenitudine Potestatis de Jure supra Jus dispensare*; and without such a Power, he saith, God would not have taken that care of his Church, which was to be expected from his Wisdom. *Jacobatius* brings several Instances of this Power in the Pope, and refers to the *Speculator* for more. *Jac. Almain* saith, That all the Canonists are of Opinion, that the Pope may dispense against the Apostle: and many of their Divines, but not all: For,

De Concess. Præbend. & propositi. Abb. c. proposuit de Conc. Præbend. C. 15. Q. 6. c. Auctoritate.

Sum. Angelic. v. dispensatio.

Jacobat. de Conciliis l. 5. p. 215. Almain. de potest Ecclesiæ, c. 13.

2. Some of their Divines held *that the Pope could not dispense with the Law of God*, as that implies a proper *relaxation* of the *Law*, but could only *Authoritatively declare* that the Law did not oblige in such a particular case, because an Inferior could not take away the force of a Superior's Law, and otherwise there would be no fixed and immutable Rule in the Church; and if the Pope might dispense in one Law of God, he might dispense in the rest. And of this Opinion were some of the most eminent School-Divines, as *Thomas Aquinas*, *Bonaventure*, *Major*, *Soto*, and *Catharinus*, who at large debates this Question, and denies that the Pope hath any Power to dispense with God's Law: But then he adds, that the Pope hath a kind of *Prophetical Power* to *declare* in what Cases the Law doth oblige, and in what not; which he parallels with the power of *declaring* the *Canon of Scripture*; and this he doth not by his own Authority, but by God's; He confesseth the Pope cannot dispense with those Precepts which are of themselves indispensable; nor alter the Sacraments; but then, saith he, there are some Divine Laws, which have a general force, but in particular cases may be dispensed with; and in these cases the Law is to be relaxed, so that the Relaxation seems to come from God himself: But he confesses this power is not to be often made use of; so that he makes this power to be no Act of Jurisdiction, but of *Prophetical Interpretation*, as he calls it; and he brings the instance of *Caiaphas* to this purpose: And he adds, that the difference between the Divines and *Canonists* was but in Terms; for the *Canonists* were in the right as to the power, and the Divines in the manner of explaining it.

Catharin. & Cajetan. 6. p. 524.

3. Others

3. Others have thought this too looſe a way of explaining the Pope's power, and therefore they ſay, *That the Pope hath not a bare declaratory Power, but a real Power of diſpenſing in a proper ſenſe in particular Caſes*: For ſay they, the other is no act of Juriſdiction, but of Diſcretion, and may belong to other men as well as to the Pope; but this they look on as more agreeable to the Pope's Authority and Commiſſion; and a bare declaratory power would not be ſufficient for the Church's Neceſſity; as *Sanchez* ſhews at large, and quotes many Authors for this Opinion; and *Sayr* more; and he ſaith *the Practice of the Church cannot be juſtified without it.* Which *Suarez* much inſiſts upon; and without it, he ſaith, *the Church hath fallen into intolerable Errors*; and *it is evident*, he ſaith, *the Church hath granted real Diſpenſations, and not mere Declarations.* And he founds it upon Chriſt's promiſe to *Peter*; *To thee will I give the Keys*, and the charge to him, *Feed my Sheep.* But then he explains this Opinion, by ſaying that it is no formal Diſpenſation with the Law of God, but the matter of the Law is changed or taken away.

Sanchez de Matrim. l. 8. Dif. 6. n. 5. Sayr. Clavis Reg. l. 6. c. 11. Suarez. de vot. l. 6. c. 9. n. 7, 8, 9, 17.

Thus I have briefly laid together the different Opinions in the Church of *Rome* about this power of diſpenſing with the Law of God, from which it appears, that they do all conſent in the thing, but differ only in the manner of explaining it.

And I am therefore afraid our *Repreſenter* is a very unſtudied Divine, and doth not well underſtand their own Doctrine, or he would never have talked ſo boldly and unſkilfully in this matter.

As to what he pretends, that *their Church teaches that every Lye is a Sin*, &c. it doth not reach the caſe; For the Queſtion is not, Whether their Church teach men to lye, but, Whether there be not ſuch a Power in the Church, as by altering the Nature of things, may not make that not to be a Lye, which otherwiſe would be one: As their Church teaches that Men ought not to break their Vows; yet no one among them queſtions, but the Pope may diſſolve the Obligation of a Vow altho' it be made to God himſelf. Let him ſhew then, how the Pope comes to have a power to releaſe a Vow made to God, and not to have a power to releaſe the Obligation to veracity among men.

Again, We do not charge them with delivering any ſuch Doctrine, *That men may have Diſpenſations to lye and forſwear themſelves at pleaſure*; for we know this Diſpenſing power is to be kept up as a great Myſtery, and not to be made uſe of, but upon weighty and urgent cauſes, of great conſequence and benefit to the Church, as their Doctors declare. But as to all matters of fact which he alludes to, I have nothing to ſay to them; for our debate is only, whether there be ſuch a power of Diſpenſation allowed in the Church of *Rome*, or not?

Page 45.

## XX. *Of the Depoſing Power.*

TO bring this matter into as narrow a compaſs as may be, I ſhall firſt take notice of his Conceſſions, which will ſave us a labour of proofs.

Page 48. 1. He yields *That the Depoſing and King-killing power hath been maintained by ſome Canoniſts and Divines of his Church, and that it is in their Opinion lawful, and annexed to the Papal Chair.*

2. *That*

2. *That ſome Popes have endeavoured to act according to this Power.*

But then he denies *that this Doctrine appertains to the Faith of his Church, and is to be believed by all of that Communion.* And more than that, he ſaith, *The affirming of it is a malicious calumny, a down right falſity.*

Let us now calmly debate the matter, Whether according to the received principles of the Church of *Rome*, this be only a particular Opinion of ſome Popes and Divines or be to be received as a matter of Faith. The Queſtion is not,

Whether thoſe who deny it, do account it an Article of Faith; for we know they do not: But whether upon the principles of the Church of *Rome* they are not bound to do it.

I ſhall only, to avoid cavilling, proceed upon the principles owned by our Author himſelf, *viz.*

1. *That the ſenſe of Scripture, as underſtood by the community of Chriſtians in all Ages ſince the Apoſtles, is to be taken from the preſent Church.* Pag. 29.

2. *That by the preſent Church he underſtands the Paſtors and Prelates aſſembled in Councils, who are appointed by Chriſt and his Apoſtles for the deciſion of controverſies; and that they have infallible aſſiſtance.* Pag. 34.

3. *That the Pope as the Head of the Church, hath a particular Aſſiſtance promiſed him, with a ſpecial regard to his Office and Function.* P. 40, 41.

If therefore it appear that Popes and Councils have declared this Depoſing Doctrine, and they have received other things as Articles of Faith upon the ſame Declarations, Why ſhould they then ſtick at yielding this to be an Article of Faith, as well as the other?

It is not denied, that I can find, that Popes and Councils for ſeveral Ages have aſſerted and exerciſed the Depoſing power; but it is alledged againſt theſe Decrees and Acts, 1. That they were not grounded upon Univerſal Tradition. 2. That they had not Univerſal Reception.

Now, if theſe be ſufficient to overthrow the Definitions of Councils, let us conſider the conſequences of it.

1. Then every Man is left to examine the Decrees of Councils, whether they are to be embraced or not; for he is to judge whether they are founded on Univerſal Tradition; and ſo he is not to take the ſenſe of the preſent Church for his Guide, but the Univerſal Church from Chriſt's time: which overthrows a Fundamental principle of the *Roman* Church.

2. Then he muſt reject the pretended Infallibility in the Guides of the Church, if they could ſo notoriouſly err in a matter of ſo great conſequence to the peace of Chriſtendom as this was; and conſequently their authority could not be ſufficient to declare any Articles of Faith, and ſo all perſons muſt be left at liberty to believe as they ſee cauſe, notwithſtanding the Definitions made by Popes and Councils.

3. Then he muſt believe the Guides of the *Roman* Church to have been miſtaken, not once or twice, but to have perſiſted in it for Five hundred years: which muſt take away, not only infallibility, but any kind of Reverence to the authority of it. For whatever may be ſaid as to thoſe who have depended on Princes, or favour their parties againſt the Guides of the Church, it cannot be denied that for ſo long

time the leading party in that Church did assert and maintain the Deposing power; and therefore *Lessius* truly understood this matter, when he said, *That there was scarce any Article of the Christian Faith, the denial whereof was more dangerous to the Church, or did precipitate Men more into Heresie and Hatred of the Church, than this of the Deposing Power*; for, he says, *they could not maintain their Churches Authority without it.*

Discussio Decreti Magni Concil. Lateran. p. 89.

P. 90, &c. And he reckons up these ill Consequences of denying it.

1. That the *Roman* Church hath erred for at least five hundred years, in a matter fundamental as to Government, and of great Moment: Which is worse than an Error about Sacraments, as Penance, Extream Unction, &c. and yet those who deny the Church can err in one, hold that it hath erred in a greater matter.

2. That it hath not only erred, but voluntarily and out of Ambition, perverting, out of design, the Doctrine of the Primitive Church and Fathers concerniug the Power of the Church, and bringing in another contrary to it, against the Right and Authority of Princes; which were a grievous sin.

3. That it made knowingly, unrighteous Decrees, to draw persons from their Allegiance to Princes; and so they became the causes of many Seditions and Rebellions, and all the ill consequences of them, under a shew of Piety and Religion.

4. That the Churches Decrees, Commands, Judgments and Censures may be safely contemned as Null, and containing intolerable Errors. And that it may require such things which good Subjects are bound to disobey.

5. That *Gregory* VII. in the Canon *Nos Sanctorum*, &c. *Urban* II. *Gregory* IX. the Councils of *Lateran* under *Alex.* III. and *Innocent* III. the Councils of *Lyons*, of *Vienna*, of *Constance*, of *Lateran* under *Leo* X. and of *Trent*, have all grievously and enormously erred about this matter; For that it was the Doctrine of them all, he shews at large; and so Seven General Councils lose their Infallibility at one blow.

6. That the Gates of Hell have prevailed against the Church: For the true Church could never teach such pernicious Doctrine as this must be, if it be not true. And if it erred in this, it might as well err in any other Doctrine, and so Men are not bound to believe or obey it.

7. That Princes and all Laymen have just Cause to withdraw from their Church; because it shewed it self to be governed by a spirit of Ambition, and not by the Spirit of God; and not only so, but they may justly prosecute all that maintain a Doctrine so pernicious to Government, if it be not true.

Let us now see what our Author saith to clear this from being a Doctrine of the Church of *Rome.*

1. *That for the few Authors that are abettors of this Doctrine, there are of his Communion Three times the number that publickly disown all such Authority.*

If this be true, it is not much for the Reputation of their Church, That there should be such a number of those who are liable to all these dreadful consequences, which *Lessius* urges upon the deniers of it: But is it possible to believe there should be so few followers of so many Popes, and Seven General Councils, owned for such by the disowners

of

of this Doctrine, except the *Lateran* under *Leo* X? The poor *Eastern* Christians are condemned for *Hereticks* by the Church of *Rome*, for refusing to submit to the Decrees of one General Council, either that of *Ephesus*, or of *Chalcedon:* and they plead for themselves, That there was a misinterpretation of their meaning, or not right understanding one another about the difference of *Nature* and *Person*, which occasioned those Decrees. I would fain know, whether those Churches which do not embrace the Decrees of those Councils, are in a state of Heresie or not? If they be, then what must we think of such who reject the Decrees of Seven General Councils, one after another, and give far less probable accounts of the Proceedings of those Councils in their Definitions, than the other do.

Discuss. Discuss. Part 3. Sect. 3. p. 1.

Philip. a SS. Trinit. Itiner. Orient. l. 5. c. 5. Clem. Galan. Concil. Eccl. Arm. Qu. 2. SS. 3. p. 92.

2. He saith, *Those who have condemned it, have not been in the least suspected of their Religion, or of denying any Article of Faith.* Let any one judge of this by *Lessius* his Consequences: And the Author of the first Treatise against the Oath of Allegiance saith in plain Terms, *That the Opinion that the Pope hath no such Power, is erroneous in Faith, as well as temerarious and impious*; And he proves it by this substantial argument; because they who hold it, must suppose that the Church hath been for some time in a damnable Error of Belief, and Sin of Practice: And he not only proves that it was defined by Popes and Councils, but for a long time universally received; and that no one Author can be produced before *Calvin*'s time, that denied this Power absolutely, or in any case whatsoever. *But a few Authors that are Abettors of it*, saith our *Representer: Not one total Dissenter for a long time*, saith the other: And which of these is the true Representer? *The deniers of it not in the least suspected of their Religion*, saith one: *Their Opinion is erroneous in Faith, temerarious and impious*, saith the other. And a Professor of *Lovain*, now living, hath undertaken to shew, that the number is far greater of those who assert this Doctrine, than of those who deny it.

*Jesuits Loyalty, first Treatise*, p. 1. &c.

3. *If we charge their Church with this Opinion, may not they as well charge ours with the like; since Propositions as dangerous were condemned at* Oxford, July 26. 1683. *as held not by* Jesuits, *but by some among our selves?* This is the force of his Reasoning: But we must desire the Reader to consider the great disparity of the case. We cannot deny, that there have been men of ill Minds, and disloyal Principles, Factious and Disobedient, Enemies to the Government, both in Church and State; but have these Men ever had that countenance from the Doctrines of the Guides of our Church, which the deposing Doctrine hath had in the Church of *Rome?* To make the case parallel, he must suppose our Houses of Convocation to have several times declared these damnable Doctrines, and given Encouragement to Rebels to proceed against their Kings, and the University of *Oxford* to have condemned them; for this is truly the case in the Church of *Rome*; the Popes and Councils have owned, and approved, and acted by the Deposing Principle: but the Universities of *France*, of late years, have condemned it. How come the Principles of the Regicides among us to be parallel'd with this Doctrine, when the Principles of our Church are so directly contrary to them; and our Houses of Convocation would as readily condemn any such damnable Doctrines, as the University of *Oxford?* And all the World knows how repugnant such Principles are to those of the Church

P. 47, 48. *Auctoritas Sedis Apostolicæ vindicata adversus Natal. Alexand. per Francisc. D. Enghien Colon. A. D.* 1684.

of *England*; and none can be Rebels to their Prince, but they must be false to our Church.

As to the personal Loyalty of many persons in that Church, as I have no Reason to question it, so it is not proper for me to debate it, if I did; since our business is not concerning Persons, but Doctrines; and it was of old observed concerning the *Epicureans*, That though their principles did overthrow any true Friendship, yet many of them made excellent Friends.

## XXI. *Of Communion in One Kind.*

FOR our better proceeding in this Controversie, I shall set down the State of it as clearly as I can.

1. The Question is not, Whether the first Institution of the Sacrament of the Eucharist by Jesus Christ, were in one Kind, or two: for all confess it was under both Kinds.

2. It is not, Whether both Kinds are not still necessary for the due Celebration of it; for it is granted that both Kinds are necessary to be upon the Altar, or else there could be no complete Sacrifice.

3. It is not, Whether the people may be wholly excluded from both Kinds, and so the Sacrifice only remain: for they grant that the people are bound to communicate in one Kind.

4. It is not concerning any peculiar and extraordinary Cases, where no Wine is to be had, or there be a particular Aversion to it, or any such thing, where positive Institutions may be reasonably presumed to have no force: But concerning the publick and solemn Celebration, and participation of it in the Christian Church.

5. It is not concerning the mere disuse or neglect of it, But concerning the lawfulness of Excluding the people from both Kinds, by the Churches prohibition, notwithstanding the Institution of it by Christ in both Kinds, with a command to keep up the Celebration of it to his second coming.

Here now consists the point in Controversie, Whether the Church being obliged to keep up the Institution in both Kinds, be not equally obliged to distribute both as our Saviour did, to as many as partake of it? Our Author not denying the Institution, or the continuance of it, saith, *Our Saviour left it indifferent to receive it in one Kind, or both.* And that is the point to be examined.

1. He saith, *Christ delivered it to his Apostles, who only were then present, and whom he made Priests just before: yet he gave no command that it should be so received by all the Faithful.*

But were not the Apostles all the Faithful then present? I pray in what capacity did they then receive it? As Priests? How did they receive the Bread before the *hoc facite?* As Priests or as Faithful? It is ridiculous to suppose the *hoc facite* changed their capacity; and if it did, it only relates to consecrating, and not to receiving: but if Christ gave it only to the Apostles as Priests, then for all that I can see, the People are not at all concerned in one kind or other; but it was intended only for Priests: If the people be concerned, how came they to be so? Where is there any command but what refers to the first Institution? And it had been more plausible, according to this Answer, to exclude

clude the People wholly, than to admit them to one Kind, and to debar them the other.

2. *Christ attributes the obtaining Life Everlasting, the end of the Institution, sometimes to receiving under both Kinds, sometimes under one,* John 6. 51, 57, 58. He could not easily have thought of any thing more against himself; for our Saviour there makes it as necessary to drink his Blood, as to eat his Flesh, *Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of man, and drink his Blood, ye have no Life in you:* If this be understood of the Sacrament, as he saith, How is it possible for him to make the Cup indifferent? Unless it be indifferent whether the People be saved or not. St. John 6. 51.

3. *Christ himself administred the Sacrament to some of his Disciples under one kind only,* Luke 24. 30. But is he sure Christ did then administer the Sacrament to them? Or that if he did, the Cup was not implied, since breaking of Bread, when taken for an ordinary Meal in Scripture, doth not exclude drinking at it? *But* St. *Augustin* he saith, (l. 49. *de Consensu Evangel.*) *understands that place of the Sacrament.* If he doth, it cannot be where he saith; for St. *Augustin* wrote but Four Books of that Subject: but l. 3. 25. he doth say something towards it; yet St. *Augustin* in another place supposes that these Disciples did both eat and drink. *The Disciples did not know him, but in the breaking of Bread; and truly he that doth not eat and drink Judgment to himself, doth in the breaking of Bread own Christ.* Where it is plain, that he applies both, to the breaking of Bread here spoken of. Tract. 2. in Epist. St. John.

4. He saith, *it was the Custom of the Primitive Christians to give it under one kind to Children, the Sick, and to Men in a Journey.* I would he had produced his Authorities to prove these things, for I can bring several to prove the direct contrary as to Children and sick Persons, and Travellers, and not only Ancient Writers, but the most Learned of their own Church. And therefore I cannot but wonder to find him saying, *This was attested by all Ancient Writers, and Modern Historians.* But I have ever found those have been most mistaken, who produce *all Writers and Historians*; when it may be, there is not one that speaks home to the business. At least, we have here none mentioned, and therefore none to examin; and it would be too hard a task to search *All.*

5. He adds to this extravagancy, in saying, *That Receiving in one or both kinds, was indifferent for the first Four hundred years*; when the contrary is so manifest, that the most ingenious of their own Writers confess it. If any Persons did carry home one kind (which is very questionable; for *Baronius* and *Albaspinæus* say, they carried both kinds) to receive it in times of Persecution, at what season they thought fit afterwards; this ought not to be set up against the general and constant Rule of the Church; which is attested, not only by *Cassander* and such like, but even by *Salmero, Ruardus Tapperus,* and *Lindanus,* who make no scruple of saying, The publick Celebration in the Primitive Church was in both Kinds. But then, how is it possible for us to judge better, what they thought themselves bound to do, than what they constantly observed in all their publick Celebrations? The Church is not accountable for the particular Fancies or Superstitions of Men; but what was observed in all publick Offices, we have reason to think the Church thought it self obliged so to do, out of regard to the Institution of Christ. And to shew how Universal this Observation was in the Church, those who give account of the *Eastern* Church say, That the *Greeks,*

Cotovic. Itiner. Hierosolol. l. 2. c. 6. Hist. Critique, p. 14.

*Nestorians*, *Armenians*, *Maronites*, *Cophtites* and *Abyssins*, do all observe it still, *viz.* That the publick Communicants do partake of both Kinds. And not one of all these Churches, but think themselves bound to observe it, out of regard to the Institution of Christ; and why then should any think the Primitive Church thought it indifferent?

6. *The first Precept of receiving under both Kinds, was given to the Faithful by Pope* Leo, A. D. 443. *and confirmed by* Gelasius, A. D. 490. This is a great mistake, for *Leo* gave no Precept about it; but only told the People how they might certainly discover the *Manichees*, for they would conform in other things, but they would not taste of the Wine: which argued, that all other Communicants did then partake in both Kinds. *Gelasius* not only confirms the Custom then used, but he saith, *That it is Sacrilege to divide that Holy Mystery.* And surely he did not account Sacrilege an Indifferent thing.

Page 52. 7. Lastly he saith, *That those who receive in one Kind, are truly partakers of the whole Sacrament.* This is a new way of Concomitancy, We used to hear of *Whole Christ* under either Species, and that *Whole Christ* was therefore received; but how comes it to be *the whole Sacrament*, which consists of two distinct Parts? And if it be a Sacrifice, the Blood must be separated from the Body, else the Blood of Christ is not considered as shed, and so the Notion of the Sacrifice will be lost: Which is our next Head.

## XXII. *Of the* MASS.

UNDER this Head, which is thought of so great Consequence in the *Roman* Church, I expected a fuller Representation than I here find; as about the *Opus Operatum*, *i. e.* how far the mere Act is effectual: About their *Solitary Masses*, when no Person receives but the Priest; About the People having so little to do, or understand, in all the other parts of the *Mass*; About the Rites and Ceremonies of the *Mass*, how useful and important they are; About reconciling the present Canon of the *Mass*, with the present Practices; About offering up *Masses* for the honour of Saints. All which we find in the Council of *Trent*, but are omitted by our *Representer*; who speaks of the *Mass*, as tho' there were no Controversie about it, but only concerning the Sacrifice there supposed to be offered up, and which he is far from true Representing: For the Council of *Trent* not only affirms *a true proper propitiatory Sacrifice to be there offered up for the quick and dead*, but denounces *Anathema's* against those that deny it. So that the Question is not, Whether the Eucharist may not in the sense of Antiquity be allowed to be *a Commemorative Sacrifice*, as it takes in the whole Action: but whether in the *Mass* there be such a Representation made to God of Christ's Sacrifice, as to be it self a true and Propitiatory Sacrifice for the Sins of the Quick and the Dead?

Sess. 22. cap. 2. cap. 1, 2, 3, &c.

Now, all that our *Representer* saith to the purpose, is,

Page 53. 1. *That Christ bequeathed his Body and Blood at his last Supper, under the Species of Bread and Wine, not only a Sacrament, but also a Sacrifice.* I had thought it had been more proper to have offered a Sacrifice, than to have bequeathed it. And this ought to have been proved, as the Foundation of this Sacrifice, *viz.* That Christ did at his last Supper offer up his Body and Blood, as a Propitiatory Sacrifice to God. And then what need his suffering on the Cross?

2. *He gave this in charge to his Apostles, as the first and chief Priests*

*of the New Teſtament, and to their Succeſſors, to offer.* But Where? When? and How? For we read nothing at all of it in Scripture. *Chriſt indeed did bid them do the ſame thing he had there done in his laſt Supper.* But did he then offer up himſelf, or not? If not, How can the Sacrifice be drawn from his Action; If he did, it is impoſſible to prove the neceſſity of his dying afterwards.

3. *This Sacrifice was never queſtioned till of late years.* We ſay, it was never determined to be a *Propitiatory Sacrifice*, till of late. We do not deny the Fathers interpreting *Mal.* 1. 11. of an Offering under the Goſpel; but they generally underſtand it of Spiritual and Euchariſtical Sacrifices; and although ſome of them, by way of Accommodation, do apply it to the Euchariſt, yet not one of them doth make it a *Propitiatory Sacrifice*, which was the thing to be proved: For, we have no mind to diſpute about Metaphorical Sacrifices, when the Council of *Trent* ſo poſitively decrees it to be a *True, Proper, and Propitiatory Sacrifice.*

## XXIII. *Of* PURGATORY.

HEre our Author begins with proving from Scripture and Antiquity, and then undertakes to explain the Doctrine of *Purgatory* from ſubſtantial Reaſons.

1. As to his Proof from Scripture.

1. Is that from 2 *Maccab.* c. 12. where he ſaith, *Money was ſent to* Jeruſalem, *that Sacrifices might be offered for the ſlain; and 'tis recommended as a Holy Cogitation, to pray for the dead.*

To this, which is the main foundation of *Purgatory*, I anſwer, 1. It can never prove ſuch a *Purgatory* as our Author aſſerts; For he ſuppoſes *a Sinner reconciled to God, as to eternal Puniſhment*, before he be capable of *Purgatory*; but here can be no ſuch ſuppoſition; for theſe Men died in the ſin of *Achan*, which was not known till their Bodies were found amongſt the ſlain. Here was no Confeſſion, or any ſign of Repentance, and therefore if it proves any thing, it is *deliverance from Eternal Puniſhment*, and for ſuch as dye in their Sins without any ſhew of Repentance. 2. We muſt diſtinguiſh the Fact of *Judas* from the interpretation of *Jaſon*, or his Epitomizer. The Fact of *Judas* was according to the ſtrictneſs of the Law, which required in ſuch Caſes *a Sin Offering*; and that is all which the *Greek* implies. Ἀπέστειλεν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα περοφορὰν περὶ ἁμαρτίας Θυσίαν. And ſo *Leo Allatius* confeſſes all the beſt *Greek* Copies agree; and he reckons Twelve of them. Now what doth this imply, but that *Judas* remembring the ſevere puniſhment of this Sin in the Caſe of *Achan*, upon the People, ſent a Sin offering to *Jeruſalem?* But ſaith *Leo Allatius*, *It was the ſin of thoſe men that were ſlain.* I grant it. But the Queſtion is, Whether *the Sin-offering* reſpected the dead or the living? For the Law in ſuch a Caſe required a *Sin-offering for the Congregation.* And why ſhould not we believe ſo punctual a Man for the Law, as *Judas*, did ſtrictly obſerve it in this point? *But the Author of the Book of* Maccabees *underſtands it of thoſe that were ſlain.* I do not deny it; but then. 3. We have no Reaſon to rely upon his Authority in this matter; which I ſhall make appear by a parallel Inſtance. He doth undoubtedly commend the Fact of *Razias* in *Killing himſelf* (2 Macc. 14. 42.) when he ſaith he did it, Εὐγενῶς *like a brave Man*; and if he had thought it a fault in him, he would never have given ſuch a Character of it, but he would have added ſome-

P. 57.

Leo Allat. de Purgat. P. 889.

Levit. 4. 13.

thing

thing of Caution after it. And it is no great advantage to *Purgatory*, for him that commends Self-murder to have introduced it. The moſt probable account I can give of it is, That the *Alexandrian Jews*, of whoſe number *Jaſon* of *Cyrene* ſeems to have been, had taken in ſeveral of the Philoſophical Opinions, eſpecially the *Platoniſts*, into their Religion, as appears by *Philo*; and *Bellarmine* himſelf confeſſes, that *Plato* held a *Purgatory:* and they were ready to apply what related to the Law, to their Platonick Notions. So here the Law appointed a Sin-offering with reſpect to the Living; but *Jaſon* would needs have this refer to the dead; and then ſets down his own Remark upon it, That *It was a holy Cogitation to pray for the dead*; as our Author renders it. If it were *holy* with reſpect to the Law, there muſt be ſome ground for it in the Law. And that we appeal to; and do not think any particular Fancies ſufficient to introduce ſuch a Novelty as this was, which had no Foundation either in the Law or the Prophets. And it would be ſtrange for a new Doctrine to be ſet up, when the Spirit of Prophecy was ceaſed among them.

Bellar. de Purgat. l. 1. c. 8.

P. 55. *But S.* Auguſt. *held theſe Books for Canonical*, and ſaith, *they are ſo received by the Church, l.* 18. *de Civit. Dei.* To anſwer this, it is ſufficient to obſerve, not only the different Opinions of others before mentioned as to theſe Books: But that as *Canus* notes, *it was then lawful to doubt of their Authority:* And he goes as low as *Gregory* I. whom he denies not to have rejected them. And I hope we may ſet the Authority of one againſt the other; eſpecially when St. *Auguſtin* himſelf, being preſſed hard with the Fact of *Razias* confeſſes, 1. *That the Jews have not the Book of* Maccabees *in their Canon, as they have the Law, the Prophets, and the Pſalms, to whom our Lord gave Teſtimony as to his Witneſſes.* Which is an evident Proof, he thought not theſe Books ſufficient to ground a Doctrine upon, which was not found in the other. 2. *That however this Book was not unprofitably received by the Church, if it be ſoberly read and heard.* Which implies a greater Caution than S. *Auguſtin* would ever have given, concerning a Book he believed truly Canonical. But ſaith *Bellarmine, his meaning is only to keep men from imitating the Example of Razias*; whereas that which they preſſed S. *Auguſtin* with, was not merely the Fact, but the *Character* that is given of it. *Sanctarum Scriptuarum Auctoritate laudatus eſt Razias*, are their very Words in S. *Auguſtin.* And therefore the caution relates to the Books, and not merely to his Example. And he leſſens the Character given by the Author, when he ſaith, *He choſe to dye nobly*; *It had been better*, ſaith he, *to have dyed humbly. But the other is the Elogium given in the Heathen Hiſtories, and better becomes brave Heathens, than true Martyrs.* Can any one now think S. *Auguſtin* believed this Writer divinely inſpired, or his Doctrine ſufficient to ground a point of Faith upon? And I wonder they ſhould not every jot as well commend *Self-murder* as an *Heroical Act*, as prove the Doctrine of *Purgatory* from theſe words of *Jaſon*, or his Epitomizer. For the Argument from the Authority of the Book, will hold as ſtrongly for one as the other. And yet this is the *Achilles* for *Purgatory*; which *Natalis Alexander* (whom our Author follows in this matter) ſaith, *is a Demonſtrative Place againſt thoſe that deny it.* But I muſt proceed.

Can. l. 2. c. 10. ad 4.

Aug. cont. ad Epiſt. Gaudent l. 2. c. 23.

De Purgat. l. 1. c. 3.

Natal. Alex. Sec. 4. Diſſ. 4.

P. 56. 2. *Purgatory is plainly intimated by our Saviour*, Mat. 12. 32. *Whoſoever ſpeaketh againſt the Holy Ghoſt, it ſhall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come. By which words, Chriſt evidently ſuppoſes, that ſome ſins are forgiven in the world to come.* I am ſo far from

from discerning this plain intimation, that I wonder how any came to think of it out of this place. Well! *But doth it not hence follow, that Sins may be forgiven in the world to come?* Not near so plainly, as that Sins will not be forgiven in the World to come. *Not that particular Sin, but others may*; How doth that appear? What intimation is there that any Sins not forgiven here, shall be forgiven there? Or that any Sins here remitted as to the Eternal Punishment, shall be there remitted as to the Temporal? And without such a kind of Remission, nothing can be inferred from hence. *But if there be a Remission in another World, it can be neither in Heaven nor Hell, therefore it must be in Purgatory.* But those who own a Remission of Sin in another World, say it will be on the Day of Judgment: For the actual Deliverance of the Just from Punishment, may be not improperly called the full Remission of their Sins. So S. *Augustin*, whom he quotes, plainly saith, *Si nulla remitterentur in judicio illo novissimo, &c.* c. *Julian*, l. 6. c. 5. where it is evident S. *Augustin* takes this place to relate to the Day of Judgment; and so in the other, (*De Civit. Dei*, l. 21. c. 24.) But as he supposed a Remission, so he did a Purgation as *by Fire* in that day. *In illo judicio pœnas quasdam purgatorias futuras. De Civitat. Dei*, l. 20. c. 25. And so he is to be understood on *Psal.* 37. to which he applies 1 *Cor.* 3. 15. But our Author was very much out, when he saith S. *Augustin* applied 1 *Pet.* 3. 15. to some place of temporal Chastisement in another World, when *Bellarmin* sets himself to confute S. *Augustin* about it, as understanding it of this World: And therefore he hath little cause to boast of St. *Augustin*'s Authority about *Purgatory*, unless he had brought something more to the purpose out of him. His other Testimonies of Antiquity are not worth considering; which he borrows from *Natalis Alexander*: that of *Dionysius Areopag. Eccl. Hierarch.* c. 7. is a known Counterfeit, and Impertinent, relating to a Region of Rest and Happiness. And so do *Tertullian*'s *Oblations for the Dead*, *De Cor. Milit.* c. 3. For they were Eucharistical, as appears by the ancient Liturgies, being made for the greatest Saints. St. *Cyprian*, Ep. 66. speaks of *an Oblation for the Dead*: and he there mentions the *Natalitia* of the Martyrs: but by comparing that with his *Epist.* 33. it will be found that he speaks of the *Anniversary Commemoration of the Dead*, which signifies nothing to Purgatory: for the best men were put into it: and St. *Cyprian* threatens it as a Punishment to be left out of the *Diptychs*: but surely it is none to escape Purgatory: *Arnobius l.* 4. only speaks of *praying for the Dead*, which we deny not to have been then used in the Church, not with respect to any temporary pains in *Purgatory*, but to the day of Judgment: And therein lies the true state of the Controversie, with respect to Antiquity: which is not, Whether any solemn prayers were not then made for the dead; but whether those prayers did relate to their deliverance out of a state of Punishment before the Day of Judgment. For whatever state Souls were then supposed to be in before the great Day, if there could be no deliverance till the Day of Judgment, it signifies nothing to the present Question.

Bell. de An. Christi, l. 4. c. 13.

As to the Vision of *Perpetua* concerning her Brother *Dinocrates* who died at Seven Years old, being baptized, it is hardly reconcilable to their own Doctrine, to suppose such a Soul in Purgatory: I will not deny that *Perpetua* did think she saw him in a worse condition: and thought likewise that by her Prayers she brought him into a better; for she saw him playing like little children: and then she awaked, and concluded that she had given him ease: but is it indeed come to this, that

such a Doctrine as Purgatory must be built on such a Foundation as this? I do not call in question the Acts of *Perpetua*, nor her sincerity in relating her Dream: but must the Church build her Doctrines upon the Dreams or Visions of Young Ladies, tho' very devout? for *Ubia Perpetua* was then but Twenty Two, as she saith her self. But none are to be blamed, who make use of the best supports their Cause will afford.

It is time now to see what strength of Reason he offers for *Purgatory*. 1. He saith, *When a sinner is reconciled to God, tho' the Eternal punishment due to his sins is always remitted, yet there sometimes remains a temporal penalty to be undergone; as in the case of the* Israelites, *and* David. But doth it hence follow, that there is a temporal penalty that must be undergone either here or hereafter, without which there will be no need of *Purgatory?* Who denies, that God in this Life, for example sake, may punish those whose sins he hath promised to remit as to another World? This is therefore a very slender Foundation. 2. *There are some sins of their own nature light and venial.* I will not dispute that; but suppose there be, must Men go then into Purgatory for mere Venial Sins? What a strange Doctrine doth this appear to any Man's Reason? That God should forgive the greater sins, and require so severe a punishment for sins in their own Nature venial, *i. e.* so inconsiderable in their Opinion that no man is bound to confess them; which do not interrupt a state of Grace; which require only an implicit detestation of them, which do not deserve eternal punishment; which may be remitted by Holy Water, or a Bishop's Blessing, as their Divines agree. 3. *That to all sins some penalty is due to the Justice of God.* And what follows from hence but the necessity of Christ's Satisfaction; but how doth it appear, that after the Expiation of Sin by Christ, and the remission of eternal punishment, there still remains a necessity of farther satisfaction for such a temporal penalty in another World? 4. *That generally speaking few men depart out of this Life, but either with the guilt of venial sins, or obnoxious to some temporal punishment*; No doubt all men are obnoxious by their sins to the punishment of another World; but that is not the point, but whether God hath declared, That altho' he remits the eternal punishment, he will not the temporal; and altho' he will forgive thousands of pounds, he will not the pence and farthings we owe to him: But if Mortal Sins be remitted as to the guilt, and Venial do not hinder a State of Grace, what room is there for vindictive Justice in *Purgatory*.

Yet this is the Doctrine which so much weight is laid upon; that *Bellarmine* saith. *They must go directly to Hell, who do not believe Purgatory*. If this be true, why was it not put into the *Representation*, that we might understand the danger of not believing so credible, so reasonable a Doctrine as this? But we believe it to be a much more dangerous thing to condemn others for not believing a Doctrine which hath so very slender a pretence either to Scripture or Reason.

Pag. 57.

S. Th. part. 3. q. 87. art. 3. in cor. v. Marsil. Columna. Hydragiolog. Sect. 7. c. 3. n. 32. Sect. 3. c. 2. 11. 15, 29. c. 3. n. 1. Bell. de Cultu Sanct. l. 3. c. 7. *Sect.* secundo.

De Purgatorio l. 1. c. 11. SS. Hæc sunt.

## XXIV. *Of Praying in an unknown Tongue.*

THE Question in short is, Whether the Church Service, at which persons are bound to assist, ought not to be in a Language understood by those who are bound to assist?

P. 59. For our Author grants, *That a Papist is bound to assist at the Church-Service, and to hear* Mass; but he is not bound to understand the Words there spoken. This

This is a plain ſtate of the caſe; and one would have thought St. *Paul's* Diſcouſe about Edification in the Church-Service and a known Tongue, and the Primitive practice, had deſerved a little conſideration, but not a Word is ſaid to either of them; and the whole is ſo managed, as tho' there had been no Rule, or any appearance of practice to the contrary. But I muſt conſider what he doth ſay,

1. *The Maſs is a Sacrifice:* And what then? Have they no other Church-Service but the Maſs? What then becomes of their Breviaries, Litanies, and all other Offices? But ſuppoſe the Prieſt's Office in the *Maſs*, be to offer the Sacrifice; are there no Prayers in the Canon of the *Maſs*, wherein the people are concerned? Why muſt not they underſtand what they are required to aſſiſt in *Prayer* for? If they have *Engliſh* Books, as he ſaith, to teach them every part and Ceremony of the *Maſs*, P. 61. why not as well the Prayers in the *Maſs*, wherein they are to join? They tell us, *It is unſeaſonable then for the People to ſay their Beads, and other Devotions:* And I ſuppoſe as unſeaſonable to talk, or think of other matters. Why then ſhould not they know what it is they are to do, and what Petitions they are then to make to God? Are there no Reſponſes to be made? No Leſſons to be read? No Creed to be profeſſed? Doth not the Prieſt ſpeak to the People to pray, and they anſwer him? Is there no Thankſgiving after the Communion which the people is concerned in? We are as much for *their Devout Affections* as they can be, but we think they are not hindred by underſtanding what they are about: P. 60. We cannot but wonder, that any man ſhould ſay, *That it nothing concerns his Devotion, that the* Maſs *is in* Latin, if he underſtand it not. Is it P. 61. no part of Devotion to join in the publick Prayers, not merely by rote, but from a due apprehenſion of the matter contained in them? He requires, *That they accompany the Prieſt in Prayer and Spirit:* And why not in underſtanding alſo? *But the Church hath ſo ordered it:* And that is the thing we complain of, as done againſt St. *Paul*, againſt the Primitive Church, againſt the natural ſenſe of Mankind, who think it is fit for them to know what they do, eſpecially in the Worſhip of God: *But it is to preſerve Unity:* Methinks however Unity in Spirit and Underſtanding is better than without it: *There are other good Reaſons:* I know not one good one; and if there were more, he would have produced them: *The greateſt part is ſaid in a low voice, that it is not poſſible he ſhould hear it:* And to what purpoſe ſhould it be ſpoken louder, if they are not to underſtand it? But why ſo low in publick? Yet the people might have Books, and join, if they underſtood what was ſaid. But why ſhould not the reſt be underſtood, which is ſpoken as if it were.

2. As to other Offices, he ſaith, *He is taught, that he may perform* P. 62. *them in a Language which he underſtands not, with great benefit to his Soul, and the acceptance of God, if at thoſe occaſions he endeavours to raiſe his thoughts to Heaven, and fix his heart upon his Maker.* But the Queſtion is not, Whether a Man may not have devout Thoughts at that time, but whether he can perform his part in the publick Offices, with true Devotion, without Underſtanding? For the publick Offices of Devotion were deſigned for the uniting the Hearts and Deſires of the people in the ſame things. It is not, Whether one Man may not pray for Heaven, and another for fair Weather, and another for pardon of his Sins, and a Fourth for Patience, and ſo on, in the ſame place, and at the ſame time, for all this might be done as well in a *ſilent Meeting*, where not a Word is ſpoken: But there being one Form of Praying for all to join together in, that with the united force of the whole Congregation, their

Petitions may go up to Heaven; The Matter now in diſpute is, Whether it be not neceſſary in order to this united Devotion, that the people all know what they pray for? And one would think nothing need to be ſaid to prove this: But what our Author adds in juſtification of this, overthrows all publick Devotion; For he ſaith, *It is not neceſſary to have attention on the Words, or on the Senſe of Prayers, but rather purely on God:* Which is to make all publick Forms unneceſſary, and to turn all Devotion into *Prayer of Contemplation:* For if this be true, all Forms whatſoever are not only uſeleſs, but burdenſome; and by the ſtinting the Spirit, do hinder the nimbler flights of the Soul, in pure ſilence towards God: And this principle muſt lead men to *Enthuſiaſms*, and unintelligible Unions; and make them deſpiſe *Forms* as a mean and dull Diſpenſation.

But at laſt he ſaith, *A Petitioner may accompany his Petition with an earneſt deſire of obtaining it, tho' the Language in which it is written, be unknown to him.* Very true, if he indited the matter of the Petition, and truſted another to put it into that Language, which the Perſon to whom he makes it, doth underſtand, but not his own: But all Languages are alike to God's Infinite Wiſdom, and ſo there can be no pretence on that account, to keep only to ſome particular Tongues, tho' unknown to the Party; and if it were ſo to all men, no man would have a Petition preſented in a Language which he did not know: But in prayer to God, the deſign of it is not to acquaint him with ſomething which he knew not, but to excite the hearts and affections of men to an earneſt deſire of the things which are fit for them to ask: Now let any man undertake to prove, that mens affections are as eaſily moved by words they do not underſtand, as by thoſe they do: and I will give up this Cauſe.

## XXV. *Of the Second Commandment.*

THE Diſpute about this is not,

Whether the Second Commandment may be found in any of
P. 63. their Books, but by what Authority it comes to be left out in any: As he confeſſes it is *in their ſhort Catechiſms and Manuals*; but not only in theſe, for I have now before me the Reformed Office of the Bleſſed Virgin, Printed at *Salamanca, A. D.* 1588. publiſhed by Order of *Pius* V. where it is ſo left out; And ſo in the Engliſh Office at *Antwerp, A. D.* 1658. I wiſh he had told us in what publick Office of their Church it is to be found: but himſelf pleads for the leaving it out, when he ſaith,
P. 64. *The People are in no danger of Superſtition or Idolatry by it; ſince the Firſt Commandment ſecures them from it; and there is nothing in this, but what is virtually contained in the Firſt, and is rather an Explanation, than a new and diſtinct Precept.* But is this ſo plain and clear, that a Man's Conſcience can never make any juſt and reaſonable doubt concerning it? There is a terrible Sanction after it; and Men had need go upon very good Grounds in a matter of ſuch moment. Hath God himſelf any where declared this to be only an Explication of the Firſt Commandment? Have the Prophets, or Chriſt and his Apoſtles ever done it? How then can any Man's Conſcience be ſafe in this matter? For it is not a trifling Controverſie, whether it be a diſtinct Commandment, or an Explication of the Firſt; but the Lawfulneſs or Unlawfulneſs of the Worſhip of Images depends very much upon it: For if it be only an Explication of the Firſt, then unleſs *one takes Images to be Gods*, their Worſhip is lawful, and ſo the Heathens were excuſed in it, who were not ſuch Ideots; but if it be a new and diſtinct Precept, then the worſhip-

ping

ping any Image or Similitude, becomes a grievous Sin, and expoſes Men to the Wrath of God, in that ſevere manner mentioned in the end of it. And it is a great confirmation that this is the true meaning of it, becauſe all the Primitive Writers of the Chriſtian Church, not only thought it a ſin againſt this Commandment, but inſiſted upon the force of it againſt thoſe Heathens who denied that they took their Images for Gods: And therefore this is a very inſufficient Account of leaving out the *Second Commandment*.

## XXVI. *Of Mental Reſervation*

UNder this Head he denies Two Things.

1. *That they are ever taught to break Faith with Hereticks.*

2. *That their Church doth allow any Equivocations, or mental Reſervations.*

As to the former I am ſincerely glad to find a Principle ſo deſtructive to all humane Society, ſo utterly diſowned, when he ſaith, *He is taught to keep Faith with all ſorts of People, of whatſoever Judgment or Perſuaſion they be; and to ſtand to his Word, and obſerve his Promiſe given, or made to any whatſoever.* And whatever Opinions and Practices there may have been of that kind formerly, we hope there will never be occaſion given to revive that diſpute. Pag. 64.

2. As to the Second: We embrace his Declaration againſt it, and hope there is no Equivocation, or mental Reſervation in it. But there are ſome things which muſt here be taken notice of.

1. He cannot deny that there are Authors in Communion with his Church, which may be charged with teaching another Doctrine; and thoſe not a few, nor inconſiderable, who not only allow the Practice of mental Reſervations and Equivocations, but ſay, with great confidence, it hath been received in the *Roman* Church for no leſs than Four hundred years; and that in ſome Caſes they are ſtill agreed in it. See *Parſon*'s Treatiſe of *Mitigation*, *c.* 7. §. 2, 3. *c.* 10. §. 1.

2. We do not deny, that *Innocent* XI. hath condemned Equivocations, and mental Reſervations in Swearing, as *at leaſt ſcandalous and pernicious in Practice*; and therefore we cannot charge the Pope with abetting this Doctrine. But we cannot but reflect on what our Author ſaid about the depoſing Doctrine, *That although Popes had believed it, and acted by it, yet the greater number oppoſed it.* And what ſhall we ſay in this Caſe, if the generality of their Caſuiſts, in ſome Caſes approve it, and think it no *Lie or Perjury*, as in that of *Confeſſion*; but if it be really ſo in any one Caſe, then it may be ſome other fault; but it is not a *Lie or Perjury* in any other, when a Man doth not think himſelf bound to ſpeak all he knows.

3. That as we highly commend the Pope's condemning ſuch Doctrines and Practices now; ſo we have reaſon to think the contrary did not once want the encouragement and approbation of the *Roman See*. As may be found in the reſolution of ſome Caſes by *Pius* V. relating to ſome *Miſſionaries*, who were to be ſent hither; and then it was declared, That if they were ſummoned before our Judges, they might *Sophiſticè Jurare, & Sophiſticè Reſpondere*; and that they were not bound to anſwer according to the intention of the Judges, but according to ſome true ſenſe of their own, *i. e.* which was made true by the help of a mental Reſervation. But it is very well, that now the very ſame things are condemned at *Rome*, as *ſcandalous and pernicious in practice*. Apud G. Abbot de Mendacio, &c. in Præf. p. 6, &c.

## XVII. *Of a Death-Bed-Repentance.*

WE have no difference with them about this matter, as far as they hold to these Points: 1. *That men are strictly obliged to work out their Salvation with fear and trembling in time of health.* 2. *That it* P. 67, 68. *is very dangerous to defer their Repentance to the last.* 3. *That if any are surprized, they ought in charity to have all possible assistance, to put them into the best way for their Salvation.*

But yet there may be some particular Doctrines owned in the Church of *Rome*, which may give men too much encouragement to put off true Repentance; as, 1. The easiness of being put into a state of Grace by the Sacrament of Penance; for which no more is required, *than removing the impediment*, as appears by the Council of *Trent*, Sess. 7. Can. 6. and afterwards it defines, *That bare Attrition doth sufficiently dispose a man to receive Grace in that Sacrament*, S. 14. *c.* 4. So that although a Man hath led a very bad Life, if he hath but this *Attrition* for his Sins when he doth confess them, he is put into a state of Grace by this Sacrament. And what can any Man expect more, and what can he do less? I do not mean a bare *natural Attrition*, the sufficiency whereof is condemned by *Innocent* XI. in the same Propositions, (Fifty seventh) but that which the Council of *Trent* calls *imperfect contrition*, *i. e.* a good motion in a man's mind to forsake his sins for fear of punishment, if really no more be required for a state of Grace but this, it is no wonder if men put off the doing of that which may be done at any time so easily by the help of a Priest.

2. The Treasure of the Church is another thing which is very apt to hinder mens speedy Repentance; for by that they believe there is a stock ready of so many Merits and Satisfactions of others, if duly applied to them by Indulgences, that they need not be at such pains to *work out their own Salvation with fear and trembling*. When a man by the Sacrament of Penance is put into a state of Grace, the eternal Punishment is discharged, and nothing remains but some temporal Pains; and to ease him of these he hath many helps, but especially the Treasure of the Church, which the Pope hath the dispensing of, as he is bound to believe; and by Indulgence he may easily get off some thousands of Years of Purgatory-Pains; and if these should fail him, there is another help yet left, which is leaving a stock for Prayers for his Soul when he dies; *which*, even our Author assures him, *are very available towards his speedier release out of Purgatory*, p. 58.

## XXVIII. *Of FASTING.*

THE Question here is, Whether a Man doth not observe their Church's Command about Fasting, who forbears all forbidden things, but takes liberty in those which are not forbidden?

It is not, Whether they may not break the Commands of God, against *Gluttony* and *Drunkenness*: But whether they break the Law of the Church about Fasting? And notwithstanding what our Author hath said, I see no reason for the Affirmative. I do not deny, 1. That it is P. 69. a very indifferent sort of Fasting, *to abstain from Flesh, unless all other sorts of Excesses at the same time be carefully avoided.* 2. *That excesses on such days are more scandalous, because there is a pretence of Fasting.* P. 71. 3. *That God's Command doth at all times forbid Intemperance.* Which

are

are the chief things he inſiſts upon. But yet this doth not reach the point, which is about their *Church's Command.* For their Caſuiſts diſtinguiſh Faſting into 1. *Natural*, which is total Abſtinence: and this is required only in order to receive the Euchariſt. 2. *Moral*, which is the ſame with Temperance, or Faſting for Health. 3. *Eccleſiaſtical*, which is defined by them to be, *An Abſtinence from Food forbidden by the Church.* And if this Definition be true, it cannot be broken but by eating what the Church hath prohibited.

And therefore their Caſuiſts, as far as I can find, are agreed in theſe things:

1. That a Man may eat a full Meal of what is not forbidden, and not break the Church's Precept of Faſting, provided Veſpers be firſt ſaid. And the later Caſuiſts blame *Covarruvias* for making any ſcruple about it. *If a Man's Exceſs comes to be a mortal ſin; yet for all that,* ſaith *Reginaldus, He ſhall not be judged as a breaker of his Faſt.* Nay, *Leſſius* goes farther, and ſaith, *He doth not loſe the merit of Faſting. Quamvis aliquis multum excedat non ſolvit Jejunium*, ſaith *Card. Tolet.* And *Paulus Zacchias* ſaith, *This is the common Opinion*; and he thinks the *Intention* of the *Church is ſufficiently anſwered.* And ſo doth *Paſqualigus*, in his *Praxis* of Faſting. Reginald. Praxis l. 4. c. l. 4. n. 163. Leſſ. de Juſtit. l. 4. c. 2. Dub. 2. n. 10. Inſtruct. Sacred. l. 6. c. 2. n. 4. P. Zacch. Qu. Medico. legales, l. 5. tit. 1. Qu. 1. p. 29, 30, 31. Paſqual. Deciſ. 120. n. 5.

2. A Man may drink Wine, or other drink, as often as he pleaſeth, without breaking his Faſt. He may *toties quoties bibere*, ſaith *Diana. Zach. Paſqualigus*, who hath written moſt fully on this ſubject, ſhews, *That it is the general Opinion, that no quantity of Wine, or other drink, tho' taken without any neceſſity, is a violation of the Precept of Faſting*; *no, not although the Wine be taken for nouriſhment, becauſe the Church doth not forbid it*; *but this laſt*, he ſaith, *is not the general, but the more probable Opinion.*

3. A Man may eat ſometing when he drinks, to prevent its doing him hurt; beſides his good Meal, he may take what quantity he pleaſes of Sweet-meats, or Fruit; he may have a good Refection at Night, and yet not break this ſtrict Precept of Faſting: *For the eating as often as one drinks, it is the common Opinion*, ſaith the ſame Caſuiſt, (who was no *Jeſuit*) *That it is not forbidden, becauſe it is taken by way of a Medicine*; and he quotes a great number of their *Caſuiſts* for it. *A Collation at Evening is allowed*, ſaith he. And *Leſſius* ſaith, *There is no certain Rule for the quantity of it.* And *Card. Tolet* ſaith, *very large ones are allowed at* Rome, *by the Pope's Connivance*; *even in the Court of* Rome, ſaith *Reginaldus.* And now I leave the Reader to judge of the ſeverity of Faſting required in the Church of *Rome.* Dian. Sam. v. Jejun. n. 7. Zach. Paſqualigi. Praxis Jejunii Eccleſ. Deciſ. 116. n. 3. Dec. 117. 1, 2, 3. Deciſ. 119. n. 2. Deciſ. 86. n. 34. Leſſ. ubi ſupr. n. 11. Tolet. ubi ſub. Regin. ubi ſup. n. 185.

## XXIX. *Of Diviſions and Schiſms in the Church.*

TWO things he ſaith upon this Head.

1. *That they are all agreed in matters of Faith.*

2. *That they only differ in ſome School-Points*; from whence he infers, That they have no Schiſms or Separations among them.

But that this is no juſt conſequence, will appear by the Schiſms and Separations among us, made by ſuch who profeſs to agree in all matters of Faith. Yet let us ſee how he proves that they agree in all matters of Faith; *becauſe they agree to ſubmit equally to the Determinations of the Church.* Page 72.

Now this very way evidently proves that they do not all agree, becauſe they do not equally ſubmit to the Church's Determinations. For,

1. Some ſay they are bound to ſubmit to the Church's Determinations,

as

as it repreſents the Univerſal Church: Others ſay no; but as the Church's Power is virtually lodged in the Guides of it. Now this is a very material Difference: For if it be on the former Account, then not the Popes and Councils Declarations are to be regarded, but as they expreſs the ſenſe of the univerſal Church; and ſo the Majority of Votes, and Numbers in the Repreſentative and Diffuſive Church is chiefly to be regarded. And on this ground ſome reject the depoſing Power, tho' plainly decreed by Popes and Councils; but they unhinge their Church's Authority by it. Now how is it poſſible for them to agree about matters of Faith, who differ fundamentally about the way how any things come to be matters of Faith? If they be decreed by Popes and Councils, ſay ſome; and ſo the depoſing Power is become an Article of Faith. No ſuch matter, ſay others, for a greater number in the diffuſive Church oppoſe it, as in the *Gallican* Church, and elſewhere, Very well! But how then can theſe Parties be ſaid to agree in matters of Faith, and an equal ſubmiſſion to the Determinations of the Church?

2. Some again ſay, That it is not the conſent of the preſent Church can make any Article of Faith, but there muſt be an univerſal Tradition from the Apoſtles times. And ſo they tell us the depoſing Power can never be an Article of Faith, becauſe it wants the conſent of all the Ages before *Gregory* VII. So that upon this ground there can be no Article of Faith which cannot be proved to be thus delivered down to us. Others again ſay, this is in effect to give up their Cauſe, knowing the impoſſibility of proving particular Points in this manner; and therefore they ſay, the preſent Church is wholly to be truſted for the ſenſe of the foregoing.

Now theſe differences are ſtill on foot in their Church, and from theſe do ariſe daily diſputes about matters of Faith, and the Seat of Infallibility, whether in the Guides, or the Body of the Church; if the former, Whether in the Church Repreſentative or Virtual? Whether the Perſonal Infallibility of the Pope be a matter of Faith or not? Our Author ſaith, Not; others ſay, Yes; and yet he ſaith, *they are agreed in matters of Faith:* So that by his own Confeſſion, they differ about other things than mere School-Points.

But ſuppoſe they were *agreed in Articles of Faith*, can there be no Schiſms or Diviſions in their Church? What thinks he of all the Schiſms between Popes and Popes? Of all the Schiſms between the Popes and the Emperors Parties? Which were as notorious, and ſcandalous, and miſchievous, as ever were in the World. What thinks he of the Schiſms between the Biſhops and the Regular Orders, which were as croſs and peeviſh towards the Biſhops and Secular Clergy, as our Diſſenters themſelves? And among the Regular Orders, what Heats and Contentions have been, *Not about the Practice of a devout Life*, I aſſure him, but about matters of Doctrine; and which both Parties ſeverally plead to be matters of Faith? As in the noted Controverſies of this laſt Age, about the immaculate Conception of the Bleſſed Virgin, the power of Grace, and the Pope's Perſonal Infallibility; and they cannot ſay they are as yet agreed about theſe things.

## XXX. *Of Friars and Nuns.*

OUR Diſpute is not, About the lawfulneſs of retiring from the World by ſuch Perſons who are rendred unfit for doing ſervice in it; and the more they ſpend their time in Devotion and Contemplation, ſo much the better.

But

But it lies in these Things,

1. Whether the Perfection of a Christian State of Life lies in being cloystered up from the World, or labouring to do good in it? For this was the great snare made use of, to draw Men into it, because they represented this as the most perfect State; whereas, according to the Doctrine and Example of Christ and his Apostles, the active Life of doing good, is far beyond it.

2. Whether, altho' such a retirement be allowed, it be a thing pleasing to God, to tie such Persons up by indispensable Vows, whatever their Circumstances may be, not to alter that State of Life; who either in Youth, or through Force, Passion, or Discontent, have entred into it? And this may be so much rather questioned, because those who assert the Pope may dispense, go upon this ground, because Circumstances may alter the obligation of a Vow; and when a greater good is to be attained, it ceaseth to oblige; which, to my apprehension, doth not prove the Pope's power to dispense, but the dispensible Nature of the Vows themselves.

3. Whether all things of this nature being liable, in continuance of time, to great degeneracy and corruptions; and the numbers of such Places being unserviceable either to Church or State, it be not in the power of the King and States of the Kingdom, to dissolve and reduce them to ways more suitable to the conveniences of both?

As to what he discourses about *Councils of Perfection, the Distractions of the World, the Corruptions of the best Things*, &c. they reach not the main Points, but are only general Topicks, which we are not concerned to debate.

## XXXI. *Of Wicked Principles and Practices.*

THE *Misrepresenter* charges the Church of *Rome* with many horrid Practices, as the *French* and *Irish* Massacres, the Murders of two Kings of *France*, the Holy League, the Gun-powder-Treason, *&c.* and charges these as being done according to the Principles of that Church.

But in answer to this, he saith, 1. In general, *That the Doctrine of it is holy, teaching the Love of God and our Neighbour, and that none can be saved by Faith alone.* In which Doctrine we heartily concur with them. Page 77.

2. *That altho' many uncertain things pass for certain, and false for true, yet he cannot deny that all ranks and degrees of men have been corrupted among them, being scandalous in their Lives, wicked in their Designs, without the fear of God in their hearts, or care of their own Salvation.* This is a general Acknowledgment, but no particular Answer to the things objected. Page 79.

3. *That the whole Church is not to be charged for the sake of such Villanies.* Very true, unless some Doctrine owned in that Church gave encouragement to them: As suppose any should ever have fallen into Rebellion upon the belief of the deposing Power, is not that Doctrine chargeable with the Consequences of it? They are extremely to blame who charge a Church with what her Members do in direct opposition to her Doctrine; but it is quite another Case, when the main ground we alledge for their Actions is some allowed Principle in it. Page 81.

4. *They are not accountable for the Actions of every Bishop, Cardinal, or Pope; for they extend not their Faith beyond the Declaration of General Councils.* But suppose General Councils have declared such Doctrines, and Popes act but according to them; is not their Church then accountable for their Actions? Page 82.

5. *There is more praying and fasting, and receiving the Sacra-* Page 83.

*ments, more visiting the Prisoners, and the Sick, more Alms-giving in any of our neighbouring Popish Towns, as* Paris, Antwerp, Gant, *&c. than in any Ten Towns of the Reformation.* And is there more *Charity* too? It doth not appear, if they be as ready to censure others, and admire themselves, as our Author, who so freely gives his Judgment about a matter it is impossible for him to know.

We see no Reason to admire or imitate the manner of their Praying, and Fasting, and receiving the Sacraments? for *to pray without Understanding*, to *fast without Abstinence*, to *receive a maimed Sacrament*, are things we do not envy them for; but altho' our Devotion be not so pompous, and full of shew, yet We may pray and fast in secret, according to our Saviour's Directions, far more than they do; however our People are mightily to blame if they do not understand what they pray for, if they do not receive more of the Sacrament than they; and we verily believe there are as great and remarkable Instances of *true Charity* among those of the Church of *England*, as among any People in the World.

## XXXII. *Of MIRACLES.*

Page 83. 1. OUR Author saith, *He is not obliged to believe any one Miracle besides what is in Scripture.*

2. He sees no Reason *to doubt the truth of many Miracles, which are attested by great numbers of Eye-witnesses, examined by Authority, and found upon Record, with all the Formalities due to such a Process.*

Now, how can these two things stand together? Is not a Man obliged to believe a thing so well proved? And if his other Arguments prove any thing, it is, that he is bound to believe them. For he thinks there is as much Reason to believe Miracles still, as in the time of the old or new Law. If he can make this out, I see no reason why he should not be as well obliged to believe them now, as those recorded in Scripture. But I can see nothing like a Proof of this. And all Persons of Judgment in their own Church, do grant there is a great difference between the Necessity of Miracles for the first establishing a Religion, and afterwards. This is not only asserted by *Tostatus*, *Erasmus*, *Stella*, *Andradius*, and several others formerly; but the very late *French* Author I have several times mentioned, saith it in expres Terms. And he confesses the great Impostures of modern Miracles, which, he saith, ought to be severely punished; and that none but Women and weak People think themselves bound to believe them. And he cannot understand what they are good for: Not to convert Hereticks; because not done among them: Not to prove there are no corruptions or errors among them, which is a thing incredible; with much more to that purpose; and so concludes with *Monsieur Paschal, That if they have no better use, we ought not to be amused with them.*

Moyens Surs & Honestes. &c. To. 2. p. 149.

*But Christ promised, that his Apostles should do greater Miracles than himself had done.* And what then? Must therefore St. *Francis*, or St. *Dominic*, or St. *Rosa*, do as great as the Apostles had done? What Consequence can be drawn from the Apostles times to latter Ages? We do not dispute *God's Omnipotency, or say his hand is shortned*; but we must not from thence infer, that every thing which is called a Miracle is truly so; or to make use of God's Power, to justifie the most incredible stories. Which is a way will serve as well for a false as a true Religion; and *Mahomet* might run to God's Omnipotency for cleaving the Moon

Moon in two pieces, as well as others for removing a Houſe over the Seas, or any thing of a like nature.

But, he ſaith, *their Miracles are not more ridiculous and abſurd than ſome in the Old Teſtament.* Which I utterly deny; but I ſhall not run out into the examination of this Parallel, by ſhewing how very different the Nature, Deſign, and Authority of the Miracles he mentions, is from thoſe which are believed in the *Roman* Church. And it had been but fitting, as he ſet down the Miracles of the *Old Teſtament*, ſo to have mentioned thoſe of the *Roman* Church which were to vye with them; but this he was willing to forbear, for certain good Reaſons. *If moſt of poor Man's impoſſibles be none to God*, as he concludes, yet every thing is not preſently true which is not impoſſible; and by this way of Arguing, there can be nothing objected againſt the moſt abſurd and idle Fictions of the Golden Legend, which all Men of Underſtanding among themſelves, not only reject for want of Authority, but of Credibility.

## XXXIII. *Of Holy Water.*

THE *Miſrepreſenter* charges him with *approving ſuperſtitious* uſes of inanimate things, and attributing wonderful effects to them; as Holy Water, Candles, Oyl, Bread, *&c.*

In Anſwer, our Author 1. declares, *That the Papiſt* truly Repreſented, utterly *diſapproves all ſorts of Superſtition.* But if he had deſigned to have repreſented truly, he ought to have told us what he meant by Superſtition, and whether any Man who obſerves the Commands of the Church can be guilty of it. Page 86.

2. He ſaith, *That theſe things are particularly deputed by the Prayers and Bleſſing of the Prieſt to certain uſes for God's Glory, and the Spiritual and Corporal Good of Chriſtians.*

This is ſomewhat too general; but *Marſilius Columna*, Arch-biſhop of *Salerno*, who hath taken moſt pains in this matter, ſums them up; 1. *As to Spiritual, they are Seven.* 1. *To fright Devils.* 2. *To remit Venial ſins.* 3. *To cure Diſtractions.* 4. *To elevate the Mind.* 5. *To diſpoſe it for Devotion.* 6. *To obtain Grace.* 7. *To prepare for the Sacrament.* 2. *As to Corporal.* 1. *To cure Barrenneſs.* 2. *To multiply Goods.* 3. *To procure Health.* 4. *To purge the Air from peſtilential Vapours.* Hydragiolog. Sect. 3. c. 2. 12. p. 45.

And now, as our Author ſaith, *What Superſtition in the uſe of it?* He names ſeveral things of God's own appointing to Parallel it? as *the Waters of Jealouſie, the Shew-bread, the Tables of Stone*; but the firſt was miraculous, the other had no ſuch effects that we ever heard of. *Eliſha's Salt for ſweetning the Water*, was undoubtedly a Miracle. Is the *Holy Water* ſo? As to the *Liver of the Fiſh for expelling the Devil*, in the Book of *Tobit*, he knows the Book is not owned for Canonical by us; and this very place is produced as an Argument againſt it; there being no Ground from Scripture, to attribute the Power of expelling Devils, to the Liver of a Fiſh, either naturally or ſymbolically: *Valleſius* offers at the only probable account of it, that it muſt be a Divine Power given to it, which the Angel *Raphael* did not diſcover; and yet it is ſomewhat hard to conceive, how this Liver ſhould have ſuch power to drive away any kind of Devil, as it is there expreſſed; unleſs by a Devil there, no more be meant than ſome violent Diſeaſe, which the *Jews* generally believed to ariſe from the poſſeſſion of evil Spirits: But however here is an Angel ſuppoſed, who made this known to *Tobit*; but we find not *Raphael* to diſcover the virtue of Holy Water againſt Devils. Valleſ. Sacr. Philoſoph. c. 18. p. 229.

As to *Christ using Clay to open the Eyes of the Blind*, it is very improperly applied, unless the same miraculous Power be supposed in it, which was in Christ himself: And so is the *Apostles laying on of Hands, and using Oyl for miraculous Cures*; unless the same Gift of Miracles be in every Priest which consecrates Holy Water, which was in the Apostles: And *Bellarmine* himself confesses, *That no infallible effect doth follow the use of Holy Water, because there is no Promise of God in the case, but only the prayers of the Church. But these are sufficient to sanctifie the Water*, saith our Author: And to what end? For all the spiritual and corporeal benefits before mentioned? Is no promise of God necessary for such purposes as those? How can any Church in the World dispose of God's Power without his Will? It may appoint significant and decent Ceremonies, but it can never appropriate Divine Effects to them; and to suppose any Divine Power in things which God never gave them, is in my Opinion, Superstitious; and to use them for such ends, is a superstitious use. St. *Cyril*, whom he quotes, speaks of the Consecration of the Water of Baptism, *Catech.* 3. St. *Augustine* only of a consecrated Bread, which the *Catechumens* had, (*De Peccat. Merit. & Remiss.* l. 2. c. 26.) but he attributes no Divine Effects to it. Pope *Alexander*'s *Epistle* is a notorious Counterfeit. Those Passages of *Epiphanius*, *Theodoret*, and St. *Jerom*, all speak of miraculous effects; and those who had the power of Miracles, might sometimes do them with an external sign, and sometimes without, as the Apostles cured with anointing, and without: But this is no ground for consecrating Oyl by the Church, or Holy Water, for miraculous Effects. If these Effects which they attribute to *Holy Water*, be miraculous, then every Priest must have not only a power of Miracles himself, but of annexing it to the Water he consecrates; if they be supernatural, but not miraculous, then Holy Water must be made a Sacrament to produce these Effects *ex opere operato*; if neither one nor the other, I know not how to excuse the use of it from *Superstition*.

De Cultu Sanct. l. 3. c. 7.

## XXXIV. *Of breeding up People in Ignorance.*

THE *Misrepresenter* charges them with this, on these Accounts. 1. By keeping their Mysteries of Iniquity from them. 2. By performing Divine Service in an unknown Tongue. 3. By an implicite Faith. To which the *Representer* answers, 1. *That they give encouragement to Learning*; and he instances *in their Universities and Conventual Libraries*; but what is all this to the common People? But their *Indices Expurgatorii, and prohibiting Books so severely*, which are not for their turn, (as we have lately seen in the new one of *Paris*) argues no great confidence of their cause, nor any hearty love to Learning: And if it could be rooted out of the World, their Church would fare the better in it; but if it cannot, they must have some to be able to deal with others in it. 2. As to the common People he saith, *They have Books enough to instruct them.* Is it so in *Spain* or *Italy?* But where they live among Hereticks, as we are called, the People must be a little better instructed to defend themselves, and to gain upon others. 3. *If the People did know their Church-Offices and Service*, &c. *they would not find such faults, since the Learned approve them.* Let them try the Experiment, and put the Bible and their Church-Offices every where into the Vulgar Tongues: But their severe Prohibitions shew how much they

Page 89.

Page 92.

they are of another Opinion: What made all that Rage in *France* againſt *Voiſin*'s Tranſlation of the *Miſſal?* Such Proceedings of the Aſſembly of the Clergy againſt it; ſuch complaints both to the King and the Pope againſt it, as tho' all were loſt, if that were ſuffered? Such an Edict from the King, ſuch a Prohibition from the Pope in ſuch a Tragical Stile about it? Such a Collection of Authors to be printed on purpoſe againſt it? Do theſe things ſhew, even in a Nation of ſo free a Temper, in Compariſon, as the *French*, any mighty Inclination towards the encouraging this Knowledge in the People? And ſince that, what ſtirs have there been about the *Mons* Teſtament? What Prohibitions by Biſhops? beſides a Bull from this very Pope againſt it. What vehement Oppoſition by others? So that many Volumes have already been written on the occaſion of that Tranſlation. And yet our Author would perſuade us, *That if we look abroad, we ſhall find wonderful care taken to keep the People from Ignorance*; but we can diſcern much greater to keep them in it.

Collectio Authorum Vulg. Verſionis damnantium Juſſu ac Mandato Cleri Gallicani edita. Lutet. Pariſ. 1661.

## XXXV. *Of the Uncharitableneſs of the Papiſts.*

THE *Miſrepreſenter*, (as he is called) charges this Point home, *Becauſe they deny Salvation to thoſe who believe all the Articles of the Chriſtian Faith in the Apoſtles Creed, and lead vertuous and good Lives, if they be not of their Communion.*

To this the *Repreſenter* anſwers in plain terms, *That this is nothing but what they have learnt from the mouth of Chriſt and his Apoſtles.* And to this end he muſters up all their ſayings againſt Infidels, falſe Apoſtles, *Gnoſticks*, *Cerinthians*, as though they were point-blank levelled againſt all that live out of the Communion of the Church of *Rome.* Page 92.

But *this is no Uncharitableneſs, but pure zeal, and the ſame the Primitive Church ſhewed againſt Hereticks, ſuch as* Marcion, Baſilides, *and* Bardeſanes, *who were condemned in the firſt Age for denying the Reſurrection of the dead*, &c. What in the firſt Age! Methinks the Second had been early enough for them: But this is to let us ſee what Learning there is among you. But do we deny the Reſurrection of the Dead? Or hold any one of the Hereſies condemned by the Primitive Church? What then is our Fault, which can merit ſo ſevere a Sentence? *We oppoſe the Church:* What Church? The Primitive Apoſtolical Church? The Church in the time of the four General Councils? I do not think that will be ſaid; but I am ſure it can never be proved: What Church then? *The preſent Church?* Is it then damnable to oppoſe the preſent Church? But I pray let us know what you mean by it; *The Univerſal Body of Chriſtians in the World?* No, no, abundance of them are *Hereticks and Schiſmaticks*, as well as we: *i. e.* All the Chriſtians in the *Eaſtern* and *Southern* parts, who are not in Communion with the Church of *Rome:* So that two parts in three of Chriſtians, are ſent to Hell by this Principle; and yet it is no Uncharitableneſs. But ſuppoſe the Church of *Rome* be *the only true Church*, muſt men be damned preſently for oppoſing its Doctrines? I pray think a little better on it, and you will change your Minds. Suppoſe a Man do not ſubmit to the Guides of this Church in a matter of Doctrine declared by them; Muſt he be Damned? What if it be the Depoſing Power? Yet his Principle is, *If a Man do not hold the Faith entire, he is gone.* But Popes and Councils have declared this to be a point of Faith; therefore if he doth not hold it, he muſt be damned. There is no way of anſwering this, but he muſt abate the ſeverity of his Sentence againſt us. For upon the ſame Page 95. Page 96.

Reaſon he queſtions that, we may queſtion many more. And all his
Page 97. Arguments againſt us, will hold againſt himſelf; *For*, ſaith he, *he that diſbelieves one Article of Catholick Faith, does in a manner diſbelieve all.*
Page 98. Let him therefore look to it, as well as we. But he endeavours to prove *the Roman Catholick Church to be the true Church, by the ordinary Notes and Marks of the Church.* Although he is far enough from doing it; yet this will not do his buſineſs. For he muſt prove, that we are convinced that it is the true Church; and then indeed he may charge us with *Obſtinate Oppoſition*, but not before. And it is a ſtrange thing to me, that when their Divines ſay, that Infidels ſhall not be damned for their Infidelity, where the Goſpel hath not been ſufficiently propoſed to them; and no Chriſtian for not believing any Article of Faith till it be ſo propoſed; that we muſt be damned for not believing the Articles of the *Roman* Faith, which never have been, and never can be ſufficiently propoſed to us. Methinks ſuch Men ſhould Study a little better their own Doctrine about the ſufficient Propoſal of matters of Faith, before they paſs ſuch uncharitable and unlearned Cenſures.

## XXXVI. *Of Ceremonies and Ordinances.*

HIS Diſcourſe on this Head is againſt thoſe who refuſe to obey their Superiors in things not expreſſed in Scripture, which is no part of our Controverſy with them. But yet there are ſeveral things about their Ceremonies we are not ſatisfied in: As 1. The mighty Number of them, which have ſo much muffled up the Sacraments, that their true face cannot be diſcerned. 2. The Efficacy attributed to them, without any promiſe from God; whereas we own no more but decency and ſignificancy. 3. The Doctrine that goes along with them, not only of Obedience, but of Merit, and ſome have aſſerted the *Opus Operatum* of Ceremonies as well as Sacraments, when the Power of the Keys goes along with them; *i.e.* when there hath been ſome Act of the Church exerciſed about the Matter of them, as in the Conſecration of Oyl, Salt, Bread, Aſhes, Water, *&c.*

## XXXVII. *Of Innovations in matters of Faith.*

THE Subſtance of his Diſcourſe on this Head may be reduced to theſe
Page 108, 109. things. 1. *That the Church in every Age hath Power to declare what is neceſſary to be believed, with Anathema to thoſe who Preach the Contrary; and ſo the Council of* Trent, *in declaring Tranſubſtantiation, Purgatory*, &c. *to be neceſſary Articles, did no more than the Church had done before*
Page 112, &c. *on like Occaſions.* 2. *That if the Doctrines then defined had been Innovations, they muſt have met with great Oppoſition when they were introduced.*
Page 116. 3. *That thoſe who charged thoſe points to be Innovations, might as well have laid the ſcandal on any other Article of Faith which they retained.*

Theſe are things neceſſary to be examined, in order to the making good the charge of Innovation in matters of Faith, which we believe doth ſtand on very good grounds.

1. We are to conſider, Whether the Council of *Trent* had equal Reaſon to define the neceſſity of theſe points, as the Council of *Nice* and *Conſtantinople* had to determine the point of the Trinity; or thoſe of *Epheſus* and *Chalcedon*, the Truth of Chriſt's Incarnation. He doth not
Page 109. aſſert it to be in the Church's Power to make new Articles of Faith, as they do imply new Doctrines revealed; but he contends earneſtly, that the Church hath a Power to declare the neceſſity of believing ſome

Points which were not ſo declared before. And if the Neceſſity of believing doth depend upon the Church's Declaration, then he muſt aſſert, that it is in the Church's Power to make Points neceſſary to be believed which were not ſo; and conſequently to make common Opinions to become Articles of Faith. But I hope we may have leave to enquire in this Caſe, ſince the Church pretends to no new Revelation of matters of Doctrine, therefore it can declare no more than it receives, and no otherwiſe than it receives. And ſo nothing can be made neceſſary to Salvation but what God himſelf hath made ſo by his Revelation. So that they muſt go in their Declaration either upon Scripture, or Univerſal Tradition; but if they define any Doctrine to be neceſſary without theſe Grounds, they exceed their Commiſſion, and there is no Reaſon to ſubmit to their Decrees, or to believe their Declarations. To make this more plain by a known Inſtance: It is moſt certain, that ſeveral Popes and Councils have declared the Depoſing Doctrine, and yet our Author ſaith, *It is no Article of Faith with him.* Why not, ſince the Popes and Councils have as evidently delivered it, as the Council of *Trent* hath done Purgatory, or Tranſubſtantiation? But he may ſay, *There is no Anathema joined to it.* Suppoſe there be not; But why may it not be, as well as in the other Caſes? And if it were, I would know, whether in his Conſcience he would then believe it to be a neceſſary Article of Faith, though he believed it wanted Scripture and Tradition? If not, then he ſees what this matter is brought to, *viz.* That although the Council of *Trent* declare theſe new Doctrines to be neceſſary to be believed; yet if their Declaration be not built on Scripture and Univerſal Tradition, we are not bound to receive it.

2. *As to the impoſſibility of Innovations coming in without notorious oppoſition,* I ſee no ground at all for it, where the alteration is not made at once, but proceeds gradually. He may as well prove it impoſſible for a Man to fall into a *Dropſie* or *Hectick Fever,* unleſs he can tell the punctual time when it began. And he may as well argue thus, Such a Man fell into a Fever upon a great Debauch, and the Phyſicians were preſently ſent for to adviſe about him; therefore the other Man hath no Chronical Diſtemper, becauſe he had no Phyſicians when he was firſt Sick; as becauſe Councils were called againſt ſome Hereſies, and great Oppoſition made to them, therefore where there is not the like, there can be no *Innovation.* But I ſee no Reaſon why we ſhould decline giving an Account, by what Degrees, and Steps, and upon what Occaſions, and with what Oppoſition ſeveral of the Doctrines defined at *Trent* were brought in. For the matter is not ſo obſcure as you would make it, as to moſt of the Points in difference between us. But that is too large a Taſk to be here undertaken.

3. There is no Colour for calling in Queſtion the Articles of Faith received by us on the ſame Grounds that we reject thoſe defined by the Council of *Trent*; for we have the Univerſal Conſent of the Chriſtian World for the Apoſtles Creed; and of the Four General Councils for the Doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation; who never pretended to determine any Point to be neceſſary which was not revealed in Scripture; whoſe ſenſe was delivered down by the Teſtimony of the Chriſtian Church from the Apoſtles times. But the Council of *Trent* proceeded by a very different Rule; for it firſt ſet up *an Unwritten Word* to be a Rule of Faith, as well as the *Written*; which although it were neceſſary in order to their Decrees, was one of the greateſt Innovations in the World; and the Foundation of all the reſt, as they were there eſtabliſhed. Seſſ. Quarta.

AN

## An Answer to the CONCLUSION.

HAving thus gone through the several Heads, which our Author complains have been so much *Misrepresented*; it is now fit to consider what he saith in his *Conclusion*, which he makes to answer his *Introduction*, by renewing therein his doleful Complaints of their being *Misrepresented just as Christ and his Apostles, and the Primitive Christi-*
Pag. 119. *ans were.* I hope the former Discourse hath shewed their Doctrines and Practices are not so very like those of *Christ and his Apostles, and the Primitive Christians*, that their Cases should be made so parallel: but as in his Conclusion he hath summed up the substance of his *Representations*, so shall I therein follow his Method, only with this difference, that I shall in one Column set down his own *Representations* of Popery, and in the other the Reasons, in short, why we cannot embrace them.

| Wherein Popery consists as Represented by this Author. | *Our Reasons against it in the several Particulars.* |
|---|---|
| 1. IN using all external Acts of Adoration before Images, as *Kneeling, Praying, lifting up the Eyes, burning Candles, Incense*, &c. Not merely to worship the Objects before them, but to worship the Images themselves on the account of the Objects represented by them: or in his own Words, *Because the Honour that is exhibited to them, is referred to the Prototypes which they represent.* p. 3. | *THou shalt not make to thy self any graven Image, or any likeness of any thing in Heaven, or Earth*, &c. *Thou shalt not bow down to them, nor Worship them.* Which being the plain, clear, and express Words of the Divine Law, we dare not worship any Images, or Representations, lest we be found Transgressors of this Law. Especially since God herein hath declared himself a *Jealous God*, and annexed so severe a Sanction to it. And since he that made the Law is only to interpret it, all the Distinctions in the World can never satisfie a Man's Conscience, unless it appear that God himself did either make or approve them. And if God allow the Worship of the thing Represented by the Representation, he would never have forbidden that Worship absolutely, which is unlawful only in a certain respect. |
| 2. *In joyning the Saints in Heaven together with Christ in Intercession for us, and making Prayers on Earth to them on that Account.* p. 5. | 2. *We have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous*, 1 Joh. 2. 1. *And one Mediator between God and Men, the Man Christ Jesus*, 1 Tim. 2. 5. *For Christ is entred into Heaven it self, now to appear in the Presence of God for us*, Heb. 9. 24. And therefore we dare not make other *Intercessors in Heaven* besides him: and the distance between Heaven and us, breaks off all Communication between the Saints there, and us upon Earth; so that all Addresses to them now for their Prayers, are in a way |

Popery as Represented.

3. *In allowing more Supplications to be used to the Blessed Virgin, than to Christ*; For he denies it to be *an idle Superstition*, to repeat *Ten Ave Maria's* for one *Pater Noster*.

4. *In giving Religious Honour and Respect to Relicks.* Such as placing them upon Altars, burning Wax-Candles before them, carrying them in Processions, to be seen, couched, or humbly kissed by the People: Which are the known and allowed Practices in the Church of *Rome*. p. 8.

5. *In adoring Christ as present in the Eucharist on the account of the Substance of Bread and Wine being changed into that Body of Christ which suffered on the Cross.* P. 10.

*Our Reasons against it.*

a way very different from desiring others on Earth to pray for us: And if such Addresses are made in the solemn Offices of Divine Worship, they joyn the Creatures with the Creator in the Acts and Signs of Worship, which are due to God alone.

3. *Call upon me in the Day of Trouble, I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorifie me*, Psal. 50. 15. When we pray to *Our Father in Heaven*, as our Saviour commanded us, we do but what both Natural and Christian Religion require us to do: But when Men pray to the Blessed Virgin for *Help and Protection now, and at the Hour of Death*, they attribute that to her, which belongs only to God, who is our *Helper and Defender*: And altho' Christ knew *the Dignity of his Mother* above all others, he never gives the least encouragement to make such Addresses to her: And to suppose her to have a share now in the Kingdom of Christ in Heaven, as a Copartner with him, is to advance a Creature to Divine Honour, and to overthrow the true Ground of Christ's Exaltation to his Kingdom in Heaven, which was, His suffering on the Cross for us.

4. *And no man knoweth of the Sepulchre of Moses unto this day*, Deut. 34. 6. Why should God hide the Body of *Moses* from the People, if he allowed *giving Religious Honour and Respect to Relicks?* Why should *Hezekiah break in Pieces the Brazen Serpent, because the Children of Israel did burn Incense to it?* 2 Kings 18. 4. Especially when it was a Type or Representation of Christ himself, and God had wrought many Miracles by it.

5. *Whom the Heaven must receive until the times of the Restitution of all things*, Acts 3. 21. And therefore in the Eucharist we adore him, as *sitting on the right hand of God*; but we dare not direct our Adoration to the Consecrated Host, which we believe to be the Substance of Bread and Wine, (tho' consecrated to a Di-

Popery as Represented.

6. *In believing the Substance of Bread and Wine by the Words of Consecration, to be changed into his own Body and Blood, the Species only or Accidents of Bread and Wine remaining as before.* P. 10.

7. *In making good Works to be truly meritorious of eternal Life.* P. 13.

8. *In making Confession of our Sins to a Priest, in order to Absolution.* P. 14.

9. *In the use of Indulgences for taking away the temporal Punishments of sin, remaining due after the guilt is remitted.*

*Our Reasons against it.*

vine Mystery), and therefore not a fit Object for our Adoration.

6. *The Bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ?* 1Cor. 10. 16. This is spoken of the *Bread* after Consecration, and yet the Apostle supposes it to be Bread still, and the *Communion of his Body* is interpreted by the next words, *For we being many, are one Bread and one Body; for we are all Partakers of that one Bread,* v. 17. Which is very different from the Bread being chang'd into the very Body of Christ, which is an Opinion that hath no foundation in Scripture, and is repugnant to the common Principles of Reason, which God hath given us, and exposes Christian Religion to the reproach and contempt of *Jews, Turks,* and *Infidels.*

7. *When ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants, we have done that which was our duty to do,* St. Luke 17. 10. And therefore in no sense can our best Works be *truly meritorious of eternal Life:* Which consisting in the enjoyment of God, it is impossible there should be any just Proportion, or due Commensuration between our best Actions, and such a Reward.

8. *And the Son said unto him, Father, I have sinned against Heaven, and in thy sight,* St. Luke 15. 21. Where Confession to God is required, because the Offence is against him, but it is impossible for any Man upon earth to forgive those whom God doth not forgive: And he alone can appoint the necessary Conditions of Pardon, among which true Contrition and Repentance is fully declared; but *Confession to a Priest,* tho' it may be useful for the ease of the Penitent, is no where in Scripture made necessary for the forgiveness of sin.

9. *I said, I will confess my transgressions unto the Lord, and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin,* Ps. 32. 5. If God doth fully forgive the *guilt* of sin, there remains no Obligation

to

Popery as Represented.

10. *In supposing that penitent Sinners may in some measure satisfie by Prayer, Fasting, Alms, &c. for the temporal pain, which by order of God's Justice sometimes remains due, after the guilt and the eternal pain are remitted.* P. 17.

11. *In thinking the Scripture not fit to be read generally by all, without licence, or in the vulgar Tongues.* P. 19.

*Our Reasons against it.*

to punishment, for wherever that is the *guilt* remains: It is true, God, may not sometimes fully pardon; but he may reserve some temporal punishment here for his own honour, or the chastisement of a penitent Sinner: But then what have any men to do, to pretend that they can take off what God thinks fit to lay on? Can any *Indulgences* prevent pain or sickness, or sudden death? But if *Indulgences* be understood only with respect to *Canonical Penances*, they are a most notorious and inexcusable corruption of the Discipline of the ancient Church.

10. *For if when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son; much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life*, Rom. 5. 10. And therefore no satisfaction to the Justice of God is now required from us, for the expiation of any remainder of guilt. For if Christ's satisfaction were in it self sufficient for a total remission, and was so accepted by God, what Account then remains for the Sinner to discharge, if he performs the Conditions on his part? But we do not take away hereby the Duties of *Mortification, Prayer, Fasting*, and *Alms*, &c. but there is a difference to be made between the *Acts* of *Christian Duties*, and *Satisfaction to Divine Justice* for the guilt of Sin, either in whole or in part. And to think to join any Satisfactions of ours, together with Christ's, is like joining our hand with God's in creating or governing the World.

11. *Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another*, &c. *Col.* 3. 16.

How could that *dwell richly in them*, which was not to be communicated to them, but with great caution? How could *they teach and admonish one another* in a Language not understood by them? The Scriptures of the *New Testament* were very early perverted; and if this reason were sufficient to keep them out of the

Popery as Repreſented.

12. *In allowing the Books of* Tobit, Judith, Eccleſiaſticus, Wiſdom, Maccabees, *to be Canonical.* P. 21.

13. *In preferring the vulgar Latin Edition of the* Bible *before any other. and not allowing any Tranſlations into a Mother Tongue, to be ordinarily read.* P. 24, 26.

14. *In believing that the Scripture alone can be no Rule of Faith to any private or particular Perſon.* P. 28.

*Our Reaſons againſt it.*

hands of the People, certainly they would never have been publiſh'd for common uſe, but as prudently diſpenſed then, as ſome think it neceſſary they ſhould be now. But we eſteem it a part of our duty, not to think our ſelves wiſer than Chriſt or his Apoſtles, nor to deprive them of that unvaluable Treaſure which our Saviour hath left to their uſe.

12. *All Scripture is given by Inſpiration of God*, 2 Tim. 3. 16. *Holy men of God ſpake as they were moved by the Holy Ghoſt*, 2 Pet. 1. 21.

Therefore, where there is no Evidence of Divine Inſpiration, thoſe Books cannot be made Canonical: But the Jewiſh Church, *To whom the Oracles of God were committed*, never deliver'd theſe Books as any part of them, being written when Inſpiration was ceaſed among them. And it is impoſſible for any Church in the World to make that to be divinely inſpired, which was not ſo from the beginning.

13. *But I ſay, Have they not heard? Yes verily, their ſound went into all the Earth, and their Words unto the ends of the World*, Rom. 10. 18.

Therefore the Intention of God was, that the Goſpel ſhould be underſtood by all Mankind, which it could never be, unleſs it were trnſlated into their ſeveral Languages. But ſtill the difference is to be obſerved, between the Originals and Tranſlations; and no Church can make a *Tranſlation* equal to the *Original*. But among Tranſlations, thoſe deſerve the greateſt eſteem, which are done with the greateſt Fidelity and Exactneſs. On which account our laſt Tranſlation deſerves a more particular regard by us, as being far more uſeful to our People, than the *vulgar Latin*, or any Tranſlation made only from it.

14. *Thy Word is a Lamp unto my Feet, and a Light unto my Path*, Pſal. 119. 105.

Which it could never be, unleſs it were ſufficient for neceſſary direction in our way to Heaven. But we ſup-

poſe

Popery as Represented.

15. *In relying upon the authority of the present Church for the sense of Scripture.* P. 29.

16. *In receiving and believing the Church's Traditions as the Doctrine of Christ and his Apostles, and assenting to them with Divine Faith, just as he doth to the* Bible. P. 31, 32.

*Our Reasons against it.*

pose Persons to make use of the best means for understanding it, and to be duely qualified for following its Directions; without which, the best Rule in the World can never attain its End. And if the Scripture have all the due Properties of a Rule of Faith, it is unconceivable why it should be denied to be so; unless Men find they cannot justifie their Doctrines and Practices by it, and therefore are forced to make Tradition equal in authority with it.

15. *Wo unto you Lawyers, for ye have taken away the key of knowledge, ye entred not in your selves, and them that were entring in, ye hindred,* St. Luke 11. 52.

From whence it follows, that the present Guides of the Church may be so far from giving the true sense of Scripture, that they may be the chief means to hinder Men from right understanding it. Which Argument is of greater force, because those who plead for the Infallibility of the Guides of the present Church, do urge the Promises made to the Jewish Church at that time; as our Author doth from those *who sat in the Chair of* Moses, *and from* Caiaphas *his Propheſying.*

16. *We have also a more sure word of Propheſie, whereunto ye do well that ye take heed,* 2 Pet. 1. 19.

And yet here the Apostle speaks of something deliver'd by the Testimony of those who were with Christ in the Holy-Mount; from whence we infer, that it was not the design of Christ to leave us to any *vocal Testimony*, but to refer us to the *written Word*, as the most certain Foundation of Faith. And it is not any Persons assuming the Title of the Catholick Church to themselves, can give them authority to impose any Traditions on the Faith of Christians, or require them to be believ'd, equally with the written Word. For before any Traditions can be assented to with Divine Faith, the Church's Authority must be proved to be Divine and infallible, either by a writ-

Popery as Represented.

17. *In believing that the Present Guides of the Church being assembled in Councils for preserving the Unity of the Church, have an Infallible Assistance in their Decrees.* P. 38.

18. *In believing the Pope to be the Supreme head of the Church under Christ, being Successor to S.* Peter, *to whom he committed the care of his Flock.* P. 40, 41.

19. *In believing that Communion in both Kinds is an indifferent thing; and was so held for the first four hundred years after Christ; and that the first Precept for Receiving under both Kinds, was given to the Faithful by Pope* Leo I. *and confirmed by Pope* Gelasius. P. 51.

*Our Reasons against it.*

ten or unwritten Word; but it can be done by neither, without overthrowing the necessity of such an Infallibility in order to Divine Faith; because the Testimony on which the Churches Infallibility is proved, must be received only in a way of Credibility.

17. *Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things to draw away Disciples after them.* Acts 20,30.

Which being spoken of the *Guides* of the *Christian Church*, without Limitation of Number, a possibility of Error is implied in any Assembly of them; unless there were some other Promises which did assure us, That in all great Assemblies the Spirit of God shall always go with the casting Voice, or the greater Number.

18. *And he gave some Apostles, and some Prophets, and some Evangelists, and some Pastors and Teachers—for the edifying of the Body of Christ—till we all come in the Unity of the Faith,* &c. Ephes. 4. 13, 14, 15.

Now here being an account given of the Officers Christ appointed in his Church, in order to the *Unity* and *Edification* of it, it had been unfaithfulness in the Apostle to have left out the Head of it, in case Christ had appointed any. Because this were of more consequence than all the rest; being declared necessary to Salvation to be in subjection to him. But neither this Apostle, nor S. *Peter* himself give the least intimation of it. Which it is impossible to conceive should have been left out in the Apostolical writings upon so many occasions of mentioning it, if ever Christ had instituted a Headship in the Church, and given it to St. *Peter* and his Successors in the See of *Rome.*

19. *For as often as ye eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come,* 1 Cor. 15. 26.

The Apostle speaking to all Communicants, plainly shews, that the Institution of Christ was, That all should partake of both Kinds, and so to continue to do as long as this Sacrament was to shew forth the Death of Christ, *viz.* till his Second coming

Popery as Represented.

20. *In believing that the Doctrine of Purgatory is founded on Scripture, Authority, and Reason.* P. 54, &c.

21. *In believing that to the saying of Prayers well and devoutly, it is not necessary to have attention on the Words, or on the Sense of Prayers.* P. 62.

*Our Reasons against it.*

ing. And there is no colour for asserting the Christian Church ever looked on observing Christ's Institution in this matter as an indifferent thing; no not for a thousand years after Christ. Altho' the Practice and the Obligation are two things, yet when the Practice was so agreeable to the Institution, and continued so long in the Church; it is hardly possible for us to prove the sense of the Obligation by a better way than by the continuance of the Practice. And if some Traditions must be thought binding, and far from being indifferent, which want all that Evidence which this practice carries along with it, How unreasonable is it in this Case to allow the Practice, and to deny the Obligation?

20. *And whom he justified, them he also glorified,* Rom. 8. 30.

But whom God justifies, they have the Remission of their Sins as to Eternal Punishment. And if those who are thus justified, must be glorified, what place is there for Purgatory? For there is not the least intimation of any other state of Punishment that any who are justified must pass through before they are admitted to Glory. We grant they may, notwithstanding, pass through many intermediate tryals in this World; but we say, where there is Justification, there is *no Condemnation*; but where any part of guilt remains unremitted, there is a Condemnation remaining so far as the punishment extends. And so this distinction as to Eternal and Temporal Pains, as it is made the Foundation of Purgatory, is wholly groundless; and therefore the Doctrine built upon it can have no Foundation in Scripture or Reason.

21. *I will pray with the Spirit, and I will pray with the Understanding also,* 1 Cor. 14. 15.

What need *this Praying with the Understanding*, if there were no necessity of attending to the sense of prayers? For then *praying with the Spirit* were all that was required: For that

Popery as Repreſented.

22. *In believing that none out of the Communion of the Church of* Rome *can be ſaved; and that it is no uncharitableneſs to think ſo.* P. 92.

23. *In believing that the Church of* Rome, *in all the new Articles defined at* Trent, *hath made no Innovation in matters of Faith.* P. 107.

*Our Reaſons againſt it.*

ſuppoſes *an attention of the Mind upon God.* And I can hardly believe any Man that thinks with underſtanding, can juſtifie praying without it: Eſpecially when there are Exhortations and Invitations to the People to join in thoſe Prayers, as it is plain there are in the *Roman* Offices.

22. *Then* Peter *opened his mouth, and ſaid, Of a truth I perceive that God is no reſpecter of perſons; but in every Nation, he that feareth God, and worketh Righteouſneſs, is accepted with him,* Acts 10. 34, 35.

Whereby we perceive, that God doth not limit the poſſibility of Salvation under the Goſpel to Communion with the See of *Rome*; for if St. *Peter* may be believed, the capacity of Salvation depends upon Mens *fearing God and working Righteouſneſs*; and it is horrible Uncharitableneſs to exclude thoſe from a poſſibility of Salvation, whom God doth not exclude from it.

23. *That ye ſhould earneſtly contend for the faith which was once delivered to the ſaints,* Jude *v.* 3.

Therefore all neceſſary Doctrines of Faith were at firſt delivered; and whatever Articles cannot be proved to have been delivered by the Apoſtles, can never be made neceſſary to be believed in order to Salvation. Which overthrows the additional Creed of *Pius* IV. after the Council of *Trent*; and puts them upon the neceſſity of proving the Univerſal Tradition of thoſe Doctrines from the Apoſtolical Times: And when they do that, we may think better of them than at preſent we do; for as yet we can ſee neither *Scripture*, nor *Reaſon*, nor *Antiquity* for them.

THus I have *Repreſented* that kind of *Popery* which our Author, (who complains ſo much of *Miſrepreſenting*) allows; and I have in ſhort, ſet down how little ground we have to be fond of it; nay, to ſpeak more plainly, it is that we can never yield to, without betraying the Truth, renouncing our Senſes and Reaſon, wounding our Conſciences, diſhonouring God and his Holy Word and Sacraments, perverting the Doctrine of the Goſpel as to Chriſt's Satisfaction, Interceſſion and Remiſſion of Sins; depriving the People of the Means of Salvation which God himſelf hath appointed, and the Primitive Church obſerved, and damning thoſe for whom Chriſt died.

We

We do now in the ſincerity of our Hearts appeal to God and the World, That we have no deſign to *Miſrepreſent* them, or to make their Doctrines and Practices appear worſe than they are: But take them with all the Advantages even this Author hath ſet them out with, we dare appeal to the Judgments and Conſciences of any impartial men, whether (the Scripture being allowed on both ſides) our Doctrines be not far more agreeable thereto than the *new Articles of Trent*, which are the very Life and Soul of Popery? Whether our Worſhip of God be not more ſuitable to the Divine Nature and Perfections, and the Manifeſtations of his Will, than the *worſhip of Images*, and *Invocation of Fellow Creatures?* Whether the plain Doctrine of the neceſſity of Repentance and ſincere Obedience to the commands of Chriſt, do not tend more to promote Holineſs in the World, than *the Sacrament of Penance*, as it is delivered and allowed to be practiſed in the Church of *Rome*, *i. e.* with the *eaſineſs* and *efficacy* of *Abſolution*, and getting off the remainders by *Indulgences*, *Satisfactions* of others, and *Prayers for the dead?* Whether it be not more according to the Inſtitution of Chriſt to have *the Communion in both Kinds*, and to have *Prayers and the Scriptures in a Language which the People underſtand?* And laſtly, whether there be not more of *Chriſtian charity* in believing and hoping the beſt of thoſe vaſt Bodies of Chriſtians, who live out of the Communion of the Church of *Rome*, in the *Eaſtern*, *Southern*, *Weſtern*, and *Northern* Parts, than to pronounce them all uncapable of Salvation on that Account? And therefore out of regard to God and the Holy Religon of our Bleſſed Saviour; out of regard to the Salvation of our own and other Souls, we cannot but very much prefer the Communion of our own Church, before that of the *Church* of *Rome*.

But before I conclude all, I muſt take ſome notice of his *Anathemas*: And here I am as much unſatisfied, as in any other part of his Book, and that for theſe Reaſons.

1. Becauſe he hath no manner of Authority to make them, ſuppoſe they were meant never ſo ſincerely: And if we ſhould ever object them to any others of that Church, they would preſently ſay, *What had he to do to make Anathemas? It belongs only to the Church and the General Councils to pronounce Anathemas, and not to any private Perſon whatſoever.* So that if he would have publiſhed *Anathemas* with Authority, he ought to have printed thoſe of the Council of *Trent*, *viz.* ſuch as theſe,

*Curſed is he that doth not allow the Worſhip of Images.*

*Curſed is he that ſaith Saints are not to be Invocated.*

*Curſed is he that doth not believe Tranſubſtantiation, Purgatory*, &c.

2. Becauſe he leaves out an *Anathema* in a very material point, *viz.* *As to the Depoſing Doctrine.* We do freely, and from our Hearts *Anathematize* all ſuch Doctrines as tend to diſſolve the Bonds of Allegiance to our Sovereign, on any pretence whatſoever. Why was this paſt over by him, without any kind of *Anathema?* Since he ſeems to approve the *Oxford Cenſures*, P. 48. Why did he not here ſhew his zeal againſt all ſuch dangerous Doctrines? *If the Depoſing Doctrine* be falſly charged upon their Church, let us but once ſee it *Anathematized* by publick Authority of their Church, and we have done: But inſtead thereof, we find in a Book very lately publiſhed with great Approbations, by a preſent *Profeſſor* at *Lovain*, *Fr. D'Enghien*, all the Cenſures on the other ſide cenſured and deſpiſed, and the holding the Negative as to the *Depoſing Doctrine*, is declared by him to be *Hereſie, or next to Hereſie:* The Cenſure of the *Sorbon* againſt *Sanctarellus*, he ſaith, *was only done by a Faction; and that of Sixty Eight Doctors, there were but Eighteen preſent; and the late Cenſure*

Auctoritas Sedis Apoſtolicæ in Reges p. 374. 408. ad 430.

P. 549. *ſure of the* Sorbon, he ſaith, *was condemned by the Inquiſition at* Toledo Jan. 10. 1683. *as erroneous and Schiſmatical*; and ſo by the *Clergy* of *Hungary*, Oct. 24. 1682.

We do not queſtion but there are Divines that oppoſe it; but we fear there are too many who do not; and we find they boaſt of their own numbers, and deſpiſe the reſt as an inconſiderable Party: This we do not *Miſrepreſent* them in, for their moſt approved Books do ſhew it.

However, we do not queſtion, but there are ſeveral worthy and Loyal Gentlemen of that Religion, of *different Principles and Practices*: And it is pity ſuch be not diſtinguiſhed from thoſe who will not renounce a Doctrine ſo dangerous in the Conſequences of it.

3. Becauſe the *Anathemas* he hath ſet down, are not Penned ſo plainly and clearly, as to give any real Satisfaction: but with ſo much Art and Sophiſtry, as if they were intended to beguile weak and unwary Readers, who ſee not into the depth of theſe things, and therefore may think he hath done great matters in his *Anathemas*, which if they be ſtrictly examined, they come to little or nothing; as,

1. *Curſed is he that commits Idolatry.* An unwary Reader would think herein he diſowned all *real Idolatry*; but he doth not curſe any thing as *Idolatry*, but what *himſelf* thinks to be ſo. So again, *Curſed is he* (not that gives Divine Worſhip to Images, but) *that prays to Images, or Relicks as Gods, or Worſhips them for Gods.* So that if he doth not take the Images themſelves for Gods, he is ſafe enough from his own *Anathema.*

7. *Curſed is every Goddeſs Worſhipper, i. e.* That believes the Bleſſed Virgin not to be a Creature. And ſo they eſcape all the force of this *Anathema. Curſed is he that Honours her, or puts his truſt in her more than in God.* So that if they honour her and truſt in her but juſt as much as in God, they are ſafe enough; *Or that believes her to be above her Son:* But no *Anathema* to ſuch as ſuppoſe her to be equal to him.

3. *Curſed is he that believes the Saints in Heaven to be his Redeemer, that prays to them as ſuch.* What if men pray to them as their *Spiritual Guardians and Protectors?* Is not this giving God's Honour to them? Doth this deſerve no *Anathema.*

4. *Curſed is he that worſhips any breaden God, or makes Gods of the empty Elements of Bread and Wine: viz.* That ſuppoſes them to be *nothing but Bread and Wine*, and yet ſuppoſes them to be *Gods* too. Doth not this look like Nonſenſe? And yet I am afraid our Author would think it a ſevere *Anathema* in this matter, to ſay, *Curſed is he who believes Nonſenſe and Contradictions.*

It will be needleſs to ſet down more, ſince I have endeavoured by clear ſtating the ſeveral Controverſies, to prevent the Readers being impoſed upon by deceitful *Anathemas.* And yet after all he ſaith,

*Curſed are we, if in anſwering and ſaying* Amen *to any of theſe Curſes, we uſe any Equivocations or Mental Reſervations, or do not aſſent to them in the common and obvious uſe of the Words.*

But there may be no Equivocation in the very Words, and yet there may be a great one in the intention and deſign of them: There may be none in ſaying *Amen* to the Curſes ſo worded; but if he would have prevented all ſuſpicion of Equivocation, he ought to have put it thus,

*Curſed are we if we have not fairly and ingenuouſly expreſſed the whole Meaning of our Church as to the Points condemned in theſe Anathemas; or if we have by them deſigned to deceive the People:* And then I doubt he would not ſo readily have ſaid *Amen.*

# THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY AND Transubstantiation COMPARED, AS TO SCRIPTURE, REASON, and TRADITION. IN A DIALOGUE BETWEEN A *PROTESTANT* and a *PAPIST.*

## The First PART.

Wherein an ANSWER is given to the late Proofs of the Antiquity of **Transubstantiation**, in the Books called *Consensus Veterum*, and *Nubes Testium*, &c.

*Pr.* I Remember your last Words at parting were, *Farewel; and God give his Holy Spirit to instruct you.* Which have run much in my Mind: For if the *Holy Spirit instruct us*, what need is there of an Infallible Church? I hope those were not only words of course with you.

*Pa.* No; but I meant that the *Holy Spirit should instruct you*, about the Authority of the Church.

*Pr.* Was this indeed your meaning? Then you would have me believe the Church infallible, becauſe the *Holy Spirit*, which is *infallible*, will inſtruct me about it, if I ſeek his Directions.

*P.* Yes.

*Pr.* But then I have no reaſon to believe it; for the *Holy Spirit*, after my ſeeking *his Inſtructions*, teaches me otherwiſe. And if the *Holy Spirit* is infallible, which way ſoever it teaches, then I am *infallibly ſure* there is no ſuch thing as *Infallibility* in what you call the *Catholick Church*.

*P.* Come, come, you make too much of a ſudden Expreſſion at parting; I pray let us return to our main buſineſs, which is to ſhew, that there is *the ſame Ground from Scripture, Reaſon, and Tradition, to believe Tranſubſtantiation, as there is to believe the Trinity*. And this I affirm again, after reading the *Anſwers* to the former *Dialogue*; and I now come ſomewhat better prepared to make it out.

*Pr.* So you had need. And I hope I ſhall be able not only to defend the contrary, but to make it evident to you, that there is a mighty difference in theſe two Doctrines, as to *Scripture*, *Reaſon*, and *Tradition*. But I pray keep cloſe to the Point, for I hate impertinent trifling in a Debate of ſuch conſequence.

*P.* I muſt confeſs, I over-ſhot my ſelf a little in the former Dialogue, when I offer'd to prove the Doctrine of the *Trinity unreaſonable and abſurd*: For no Church can make ſuch a Doctrine, which is unreaſonable and abſurd in it ſelf, not to be ſo to me: No Church can make *three and one to be the ſame, if they be repugnant in themſelves*. But my meaning was, that Mens Diſputes about theſe things will never be ended, till they ſubmit to the *Authority* of the *Church*.

*Pr.* And then they may believe *three, or three hundred Perſons* in the *Trinity*, as the Church pleaſes. Is that your meaning?

*P.* No. But I ſaid, *to my carnal Reaſon* it would appear ſo; but not to my Reaſon as under the conduct of an *infallible Guide*.

*Pr.* Then an *infallible Guide* can make *three hundred to be but three*, which is a notable trick of Infallibility.

*P.* No; I tell you that I meant only that we are not to follow *Carnal Reaſon*, but the *Church's Authority*, *i. e.* we are not to ſearch into Myſteries above Reaſon, but only believe what the Church delivers. And I intend now to argue the Point ſomewhat cloſely with you. Do you believe that there are any Myſteries in the Chriſtian Doctrine above Reaſon, or not? if not, you muſt reject the *Trinity*; if you do, then you have no ground for rejecting *Tranſubſtantiation*, becauſe it is above Reaſon.

*Pr.* You clearly miſtake us; and I perceive were very little acquainted with our Doctrine; for we do not reject any Doctrine concerning God, merely becauſe it is above our Reaſon, when it is otherwiſe clearly proved from Scripture. For then we own our ſelves bound to ſubmit in matters of Divine Revelation concerning an infinite Being, though they be above our Capacity to comprehend them. But in matters of a *finite Nature*, which are far more eaſie for us to conceive, and which depend upon the evidence of Senſe, we may juſtly reject any Doctrine which overthrows that Evidence, and is not barely *above our Reaſon*, but *repugnant* to it.

*P.* I do not well underſtand you.

*Pr.* So I believe; but I will endeavour to help your Underſtanding a little. And I pray conſider theſe things:

1. That there is a great difference in our Conceptions of *Finite* and *Infinite* Beings. For, whatſoever is *Infinite*, is thereby owned to be above our Comprehenſion, otherwiſe it would not be Infinite. The Attributes of God, which are eſſential to him, as his Wiſdom, Goodneſs and Power, muſt be underſtood by us, ſo far as to form a true Notion of that Being which is infinite; but then the *Infinity* of theſe Attributes is above our reach. And ſo his *infinite Duration*, which we call *Eternity*; his infinite Preſence, which we call his *Immenſity*; the *infinite Extent* of his *Knowledge*, as to future Contingencies; all theſe muſt be confeſſed to be *Myſteries*, not above our Reaſon, but above our Capacity. For we have great reaſon to own them, but we have not Faculties to comprehend them. We cannot believe a God, unleſs we hold him to be infinite in all Perfections; and if he be infinite, he muſt be incomprehenſible; ſo that Religion muſt be overthrown, if ſomething incomprehenſible be not allowed. And as to finite Beings, ſo far as they run into what we call *Infinite*, they are ſo far out of our reach, as appears by the inſuperable Difficulties about the infinite Diviſibility of Quantity.

2. That we have certain Notions of ſome things in the viſible World; both that they are, and that they have ſome Attributes eſſential to them. We daily converſe with things viſible and corporeal; and if we do not conceive ſomething true and certain in our Minds about them, we live in a Dream, and have only Phantaſms and Illuſions about us. If we are certain that there are real Bodies, and not mere Appearances, there muſt be ſome certain way of conveying ſuch Impreſſions to our Minds, from whence they may conclude, this is a Horſe, and this a Man, and this is Fleſh, and this Blood, and this is Wood, and this Stone; otherwiſe all certainty is gone, and we muſt turn mere Scepticks.

3. That in examining the ſenſe of Scripture, we may make uſe of thoſe certain Notions of viſible things, which God and Nature have planted in us; otherwiſe we are not dealt with as reaſonable Creatures. And therefore we muſt uſe thoſe Faculties God hath given us, in reading and comparing Scriptures, and examining the ſenſe that is offered by ſuch Notions which are agreeable to the nature of things. As for inſtance, the Scripture frequently attributes *Eyes* and *Ears* and *Hands* to the *Almighty*, muſt we preſently believe God to have an human Shape becauſe of this? No, we compare theſe with the neceſſary Attributes of God, and from thence ſee a neceſſity of interpreting theſe Expreſſions in a Senſe agreeable to the Divine Nature. So if other Expreſſions of *Scripture* ſeem to affirm that of a *Body*, which is inconſiſtent with the Nature of it; as, that it is not viſible, or may be in many Places at once, there is ſome reaſon for me to underſtand them in a Senſe agreeable to the eſſential Properties of a Body.

4. There is a difference between our not apprehending the manner how a thing is, and the apprehending the impoſſibility of the thing it ſelf. And this is the meaning of the diſtinction of things *above our Reaſon*, and *contrary to our Reaſon*. If the Queſtion be, how the ſame individual Nature can be communicated to three diſtinct Perſons? We may juſtly anſwer, we cannot apprehend the manner of it, no more than we can the *Divine Immenſity*, or an *infinite Amplitude* without *Extenſion*. But if any go about to prove there is an impoſſibility in the thing, he

must prove that the Divine Nature can communicate it self no otherwise than a finite individual Nature can: For all acknowledge the same common Nature may be communicated to three Persons, and so the whole Controversie rests on this single Point as to Reason; whether the Divine Nature and Persons are to be judged and measured as Human Nature and Persons are. And in this, I think, we have the advantage in point of Reason of the *Anti-trinitarians* themselves, although they pretend never so much to it.

*P.* Good night, Sir; I perceive you are in for an hour; and I have not so much time to spare, to hear such long Preachments. For my part, talk of *Sense* and *Reason* as long as you will, I am for the *Catholick Church.*

*Pr.* And truly, she is mightily obliged to you for opposing her *Authority* to *Sense* and *Reason.*

*P.* Call it what you will, I am for the *Church's Authority*; and the talk of *Sense* and *Reason* is but *Canting* without that.

*Pr.* The matter is then come to a fine pass; I thought *Canting* had rather been that which was spoken against *Sense* or *Reason.* But I pray, Sir, what say you to what I have been discoursing?

*P.* To tell you truth, I did not mind it; for as soon as I heard whither you were going, I clapt fast hold of the Church, as a Man would do of a Mast in a Storm, and resolved not to let go my hold.

*Pr.* What! although you should sink together with it.

*P.* If I do, the Church must answer for it; for I must sink or swim with it.

*Pr.* What Comfort will that be to you, when you are called to an account for your self? But if you stick here, it is to no purpose to talk any more with you.

*P.* I think so too. But now we are in, methinks we should not give over thus; especially since I began this Dialogue about the *Trinity* and *Transubstantiation.*

*Pr.* If you do, we know the Reason of it. But I am resolved to push this matter now as far as it will go; and either to convince you of your Mistake, or at least to make you give it over wholly.

*P.* But if I must go on in my Parallel, I will proceed in my own way. I mentioned three things, *Scripture, Reason, and Tradition.* And I will begin with *Tradition.*

*Pr.* This is somewhat an uncouth Method; but I must be content to follow your Conduct.

*P.* No, Sir, the Method is very natural; *for in Mysteries above Reason, the safest way is to trust Tradition. And none can give so good account of that as the Church.*

*Pr.* Take your own way: but I perceive *Tradition* with you is *the Sense of the present Church*; which is as hard to conceive, as that a *Nunc stans* should be an eternal Succession.

*P.* As to comparing *Tradition*, I say, *that the Mystery of the Trinity was questioned in the very Infancy of the Church, and the Arians prevail'd much against it in the beginning of the fourth Age; but Transubstantiation lay unquestion'd and quiet for a long time; and when it came into debate, there was no such opposition as that of* Arius, *to call in question the Authority of its Tradition; the Church received it unanimously, and in that Sense continued till rash Reason attempted to fathom the unlimited Miracles and Mysteries of God.*

*Pr.* I

*Pr.* I ſtand amazed at the boldneſs of this Aſſertion: But I find your preſent Writers are very little vers'd in *Antiquity*; which makes them offer things concerning the Ancient Church, eſpecially as to *Tranſubſtantiation*, which thoſe who had been modeſt and learned, would have been aſhamed of.

*P.* I hope I may make uſe of them to juſtifie my ſelf, tho' you ſlight them, I mean the *Conſenſus Veterum*, the *Nubes Teſtium*, and the ſingle *Sheet about Tranſubſtantiation.*

*Pr.* Take them all, and as many more as you pleaſe, I am ſure you can never prove *Tranſubſtantiation* to have been, and the *Trinity* not to have been the conſtant Belief of the Primitive Church.

*P.* Let me manage my own Argument firſt.

*Pr.* All the Reaſon in the World.

*P.* My Argument is, *That the Doctrine of the Trinity met with far more Oppoſition than Tranſubſtantiation did.*

*Pr.* Good Reaſon for it, becauſe it was never heard of then. You may as well ſay, the *Tradition* of the Circulation of the Blood lay very quiet, from the days of *Hippocrates* to the time of *Pariſanus*. Who was there that oppoſed things before they were thought of?

*P.* That is your great Miſtake; for *Tranſubſtantiation* was very well known, but they did not happen to ſpeak ſo much of it, becauſe it was not oppoſed.

*Pr.* But how is it poſſible for you to know it was ſo well known, if they ſpake not of it?

*P.* I did not ſay, they did not ſpeak of it, but not ſo much, or not *half ſo expreſs*; *becauſe it is not cuſtomary for Men to argue unqueſtionable Truths.*

*Pr.* But ſtill how ſhall it be known that the Church received this Doctrine *unanimouſly*, if they do not ſpeak expreſly of it? But ſince you offer at no Proof of your Aſſertion, I will make a fair offer to you, and undertake to prove, That the Fathers ſpake *expreſly againſt it*,

*P.* How is that? *Expreſly againſt it?* God forbid.

*Pr.* Make of it what you pleaſe, and anſwer what you can: I begin with my Proofs.

*P.* Nay, then, we are in for all Night. I am now full of buſineſs, and cannot hearken to tedious Proofs out of the Fathers, which have been canvaſſed a hundred times.

*Pr.* I will be as ſhort as I can; and I promiſe you not to tranſcribe any that have hitherto written, nor to urge you with any ſpurious Writer, or lame Citation at ſecond or third hand; and I ſhall produce nothing but what I have read, conſidered, and weighed in the *Authors themſelves.*

*P.* Since it muſt be ſo; let me hear your doubty Arguments, which I cannot as well turn againſt the *Trinity*; For that is my Point.

*Pr.* I leave you to try your Skill upon them. The firſt ſhall be from the Proofs of the Truth of *Chriſt's Incarnation*; and I hope this will not hold againſt the *Trinity*. And thoſe Arguments which they brought to prove Chriſt *Incarnate*, do overthrow *Tranſubſtantiation* effectually. So that either we muſt make the Fathers to reaſon very ill againſt *Heretick*s; or, if their Arguments be good, it was impoſſible they ſhould believe *Tranſubſtantiation*. For can you ſuppoſe that any can believe it, who ſhould not barely aſſert, but make the force of an Argument to lie in

in this, that the Substance of the Bread doth not remain after Consecration? And this I now prove, not from any slight inconsiderable Authors, but from some of the greatest Men in the Church in their time. I begin with St. *Chrysostom*, whose Epistle to *Cæsarius* is at last brought to light by a learned Person of the *Roman* Communion; who makes no question of the Sincerity of it, and saith, *The Latin Translation which only he could find entire, was about five hundred years old*; but he hath so confirm'd it by the *Greek Fragments* of it, quoted by Ancient *Greek* Authors, that there can be no suspicion left concerning it.

*P.* What means all this ado before you come to the Point?

*Pr.* Because this *Epistle* hath been formerly so confidently denied to be St. *Chrysostom*'s; and such care was lately taken to suppress it.

*P.* But what will you do with it now you have it?

*Pr.* I will tell you presently. This *Epistle* was written by him for the satisfaction of *Cæsarius* a Monk, who was in danger of being seduced by the *Apollinarists*.

*P.* What have we to do with the *Apollinarists?* Do you think all hard words are akin, and so the affinity rises between *Apollinarists* and *Transubstantiation?*

*Pr.* You shall find it comes nearer the matter than you imagined. For those *Hereticks* denied the Truth of the Human Nature of Christ after the Union, and said that the Properties of it did then belong to the *Divine Nature*; as appears by that very Epistle.

*P.* And what of all this? Do we deny the truth of Christ's Human Nature?

*Pr.* No; but I pray observe the force of his Parallel. He is proving that *each Nature in Christ contains its Properties*; for, saith he, *as before Consecration we call it Bread, but after it by Divine Grace sanctifying it through the Prayer of the Priest, it is no longer called Bread, but the Body of our Lord, altho' the nature of Bread remains in it; and it doth not become two Bodies, but one Body of Christ; so here the Divine Nature being joyned to the Human, they both make one Son, and one Person.*

Sicut enim antequam sanctificatur panis, panem nominamus, divinâ autem illum sanctificante Gratiâ, mediante Sacerdote, liberatus est quidem ab appellatione panis, dignus autem habitus est Dominici Corporis appellatione, etiamsi natura Panis in ipso permansit, & non duo Corpora, sed unum Corpus Filii prædicatur, sic & hic divina ἐνἰδρυμάσης (ἐνἰδρυμένης in Græc. Exemplar Ep. Eigot.) id est inundante Corporis Natura unum Filium, unam Personam utraq; hæc fecerunt.

*P.* And what do you infer from hence?

*Pr.* Nothing more, but that the *Nature of Bread* doth as certainly remain after *Consecration*, as the *Nature* of *Christ* doth after the *Union*.

*P.* Hold a little. For the Author of the single Sheet, saith, *That the Fathers by Nature and Substance do often mean no more than the natural Qualities, or visible Appearances of Things.* And why may not St. *Chrysostom* mean so here?

Papist Misrepresented, and Represented, 2 *Part. ch.* 3. *p.* 23.

*Pr.* I say, it is impossible he should. For all the Dispute was about *the Substance*, and not about *the Qualities*, as appears by that very Epistle; for those *Hereticks* granted, that Christ had all the *Properties* of a Body left still; they do not deny that Christ could suffer, but they said, the Properties of a Body after the Union belonged to the *Divine Nature*, the Human Nature being swallowed up by the Union. And therefore St. *Chrysostom*, by *Nature*, must understand *Substance*, and not *Qualities*; or else he doth by no means prove that which he aimed at. So that St. *Chrysostom* doth manifestly assert the *Substance* of the *Bread* to remain after *Consecration*.

*P.* But

*P.* But doth not St. *Chryſoſtom* ſuppoſe then, that upon Conſecration, *The Bread is united to the Divinity, as the Humane Nature is to the Divine*; elſe what Parallel could he make?

*Pr.* I will deal freely with you by declaring, that not St. *Chryſoſtom* only, but many others of the *Fathers*, did own the Bread after Conſecration to be made the *real Body of Chriſt*; but not in your Senſe, by changing *the Subſtance* of the *Elements* into that Body of Chriſt which is in Heaven; but by a *Myſtical Union*, cauſed by the *Holy Spirit*, whereby the Bread becomes *the Body of Chriſt*, as that was which was conceived in the Womb of the Bleſſed Virgin. But this is quite another thing from *Tranſubſtantiation*; and the Church of *England* owns, that after Conſecration, *The Bread and Wine are the Body and Blood of Chriſt.*

*P.* But altho' this be not *Tranſubſtantiation*, it may be ſomething as hard to believe or underſtand.

*Pr.* By no means. For all the difficulties relating to the taking away *the Subſtance* of the Bread, and the *Properties* of Chriſt's Body, are removed by this *Hypotheſis.*

*P.* Let us then keep to our Point; but methinks this is but a ſlender appearance yet; St. *Chryſoſtom* ſtands alone for all that I ſee.

*Pr.* Have but a little Patience, and you ſhall ſee more of his mind preſently. But I muſt firſt tell you, that the *Eutychians* afterwards were condemned in the Council of *Chalcedon* for following this Doctrine of *Apollinaris*; and that Council defines, *that the differences of the two Natures in Chriſt were not deſtroyed by the Union; but that their Properties were preſerved diſtinct and concur to one Perſon.* And againſt theſe, the other Fathers diſputed juſt as St. *Chryſoſtom* had done before againſt the *Apollinariſts.* Concil. Chalced. Act. 5.

*Theodoret* brings the ſame Inſtance, and he affirms expreſly, *That the Nature of the Elements is not changed, that they do not loſe their proper Nature, but remain in their former Subſtance, Figure and Form, and may be ſeen and touched as before.*

Still this is not to prove any *Accidental Qualities*, but the very *Subſtance* of Chriſt's Body to remain.

Ὁ γὰρ δὴ τὸ φύσει σῶμα σίτον καὶ ἄρτον προσαγορεύσας, καὶ αὖ πάλιν ἑαυτὸν ἀμπελον ὀνομάσας, οὗτος τὰ ὁρώμενα σύμβολα τῇ τοῦ σώματος προσηγορίᾳ τετίμηκεν, οὐ τὴν φύσιν μεταβαλὼν, ἀλλὰ τὴν χάριν τῇ φύσει προστεθηκώς. Dial. 1.

Οὐδὲ γὰρ μετὰ τὴν Ἁγιαμὸν τὰ μυστικὰ σύμβολα τῆς οἰκείας ἐξίσταται φύσεως, μένει γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς προτέρας οὐσίας καὶ τῆς σχήματος, καὶ τῆς εἴδους, καὶ ὁρατά ἐστι καὶ ἁπτὰ, οἷα καὶ πρότερον ἦν. Dial. 2.

*P.* But was not *Theodoret* a Man of ſuſpected Faith in the Church: and therefore no great matter can be made of his Teſtimony.

*Pr.* Yield it then to us; and ſee if we do not clear *Theodoret*; but your own learned Men never queſtion him, as to this matter (at leaſt) and the ancient Church hath vindicated his Reputation. And he ſaith no more than St. *Chryſoſtom* before him, and others of great Eſteem after him.

*P.* Who were they?

*Pr.* What ſay you to a *Pope*, whom you account *Head of the Church?* Pope *Gelaſius* writing againſt the ſame *Hereticks*, produces the ſame Example; and he expreſly ſaith, *The Subſtance of the Bread and Wine doth not ceaſe.* Certè Sacramenta quæ ſumimus Corporis & Sanguinis Domini divina res eſt, propter quod & per eadem divinæ efficimur conſortes Naturæ, & tamen eſſe non deſinit ſubſtantia vel natura Panis & Vini. *Gelaſ. in Biblioth. Patr. To.* 4.

P. I

*P.* I thought I ſhould find you tripping. Here you put a Fob-head of the Church upon us. For the Author of the ſingle Sheet ſaith, *this was another* Gelaſius, *as is prov'd at large by* Bellarmin.

Pag. 20.

*Pr.* In truth, I am aſhamed of the Ignorance of ſuch ſmall Authors, who will be medling with things they underſtand not. For this Writer, ſince *Bellarmin*'s time, hath been evidently proved from Teſtimonies of Antiquity, ſuch as *Fulgentius* and *John* the ſecond, to have been Pope *Gelaſius*, and that by ſome of the moſt learned Perſons of the *Roman* Communion, ſuch as Cardinal *Du Perron*, *Petavius*, *Sirmondus*, and others.

*P.* Have you any more that talk at this rate?

Οὕτω καὶ παρὰ τῶν πιστῶν λαμβανόμενον σῶμα Χριστοῦ, καὶ τὴν αἰσθητῆς οὐσίας οὐκ ἐξίστατο καὶ τὴν νοητῆς ἀδιαίρετον μένει χάριτος. Ephræm. Antioch. ap. Phot. Cod. 229.

*Pr.* Yes. What think you of a *Patriarch* of *Antioch*, who uſeth the ſame Similitude for the ſame purpoſe; and he affirms, that the ſenſible Subſtance ſtill continues in the Euchariſt, tho' it hath Divine Grace joined with it? And I pray, now tell me ſeriouſly, did the *Tradition of Tranſubſtantiation lie unqueſtion'd and quiet all this while?* when we have three Patriarchs of *Conſtantinople*, *Rome*, and *Antioch*, expreſly againſt it; and one of them owned by your Selves, to be Head of the Church; and held by many to be Infallible, eſpecially when he teaches the Church; which he doth, if ever, when he declares againſt Hereticks.

*P.* I know not what to ſay, unleſs by *Nature and Subſtance* they meant *Qualities and Properties.*

*Pr.* I have evidently proved that could not be their meaning.

Tom. 3. l. 5. c. 1, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11.

*P.* But I am told Monſieur *Arnaud* in his elaborate Defence againſt *Claude* goes that way, and he ſaith, *The Eutychians and Apollinariſts did not abſolutely deny any Subſtance to remain in Chriſt's Body, but not ſo as to be endued with ſuch Properties as ours have.*

Ap. Facund. l. 8. c. 5.

*Pr.* I grant this is the main of his Defence; but I confeſs, Monſieur *Arnaud* hath not ſo much Authority with me, as a *General Council* which declared the contrary; *viz. That the Eutychians were condemned for not holding two Subſtances or Natures in Chriſt after the Union.* And *Domnus Antiochenus*, who firſt laid open the *Eutychian* Hereſie, ſaith, *It lay in making a mixture and confuſion of both Natures in Chriſt, and ſo making the Divinity paſſible*; and to the ſame purpoſe others. There were ſome who charged both *Apollinaris* and *Eutyches* with holding, *that Chriſt brought his Body from Heaven, and that it was not con-ſubſtantial with ours*; but *Apollinaris* himſelf, in the *Fragments* preſerved by *Leontius*, not only denies it, but *pronounces an Anathema againſt thoſe that hold it.* And *Vitalis* of *Antioch*, a great Diſciple of his, in diſcourſe with *Epiphanius*, utterly denied *a Cœleſtial Body in Chriſt. Vincentius Lirinenſis* ſaith, *his Hereſie lay in denying two diſtinct Subſtances in Chriſt.* St. *Auguſtin* ſaith, *he held but one Subſtance after the Union*; ſo that he muſt deny any *Subſtance* of a Body to remain after the Union, which he aſſerted to be wholly ſwallowed up, and the Properties to continue: Which was another kind of *Tranſubſtantiation*; for no more of the *Subſtance of Chriſt's Body* was ſuppoſed to remain after the Union, than there is ſuppoſed to be in the Elements after Conſecration. But in both Caſes the *Properties and Qualities* were the ſame ſtill. And it is obſervable, that in the Acts of the Council of *Chalcedon*, *Eutyches* rejected it, *as a Calumny caſt upon him, that he ſhould hold that Chriſt brought a Body from Heaven.* But the *Eutychian* Doctrine lay in taking away the *Subſtance* of the Body, and making the *Divinity* the *ſole Subſtance*,

Ap. Caniſ. Antiq. Lection. To. 4. p. 112, 114, 127.

Epiph. hær. 77. Vincent. Common. Aug. de Hæreſ. c. 55.

Concil. Chalced. Act. 1.

*ſtance*, but with the *Accidents* and *Properties* of the Body. And for this they produced the Words of Saint *John*, *The Word was made Fleſh*; which they urged with the ſame Confidence that you now do, *This is my Body*. And when they were urged with Difficulties, they made the very ſame recourſe to *God's Omnipotency*, and *the Letter of Scripture*, and made the ſame Declamations againſt the *uſe of Reaſon* that you do; and withal, they would not have the Human Nature to be annihilated but to be changed into the Divine; juſt as your Authors do about the *Subſtance* of the Bread. So that it is hard to imagin a more exact Parallel to *Tranſubſtantiation* than there is in this Doctrine; and conſequently there can be no more evident Proof of it, than the Fathers making uſe of the Inſtance of the *Euchariſt*, to ſhew, that as the *Subſtance* of Bread doth remain after *Conſecration*; ſo the Subſtance of *Chriſt's Body* doth continue after the Union. And when the Fathers from the remaining *Properties* do prove the *Subſtance* to remain, they overthrow the poſſibility of *Tranſubſtantiation*. For, if they might be without the Subſtance, their whole Argument loſes its force, and proves juſt nothing. Theodor. Dial. 1. & 2.

*P.* But all this proves nothing as to the *Faith* of the *Church*; being only Arguments uſed by *Divines* in the heat of *Diſputes*.

*Pr.* Do you then in earneſt give up the Fathers as *Diſputants* to us; but retain them as *Believers* to your ſelves? But *how ſhould we know their Faith but by their Works?*

*P.* I perceive you have a mind to be pleaſant; but my meaning was, that in *Diſputes* Men may eaſily over-ſhoot themſelves, and uſe ineffectual Arguments.

*Pr.* But is it poſſible to ſuppoſe they ſhould draw Arguments from ſomething againſt the *Faith* of the *Church?* As for inſtance; Suppoſe now we are diſputing about *Tranſubſtantiation*, you ſhould bring an Argument from the *Human Nature of Chriſt*, and ſay, That as in the Hypoſtatical Union the Subſtance is changed, and nothing but the Accidents remain; ſo it is in the Elements upon Conſecration. Do you think I ſhould not preſently deny your Example, and ſay, your very Suppoſition is *Heretical?* So no doubt would the *Eutychians* have done in caſe the Faith of the Church had then been, that the *Subſtance* of the Elements was changed after *Conſecration*. And the *Eutychians* were the moſt ſottiſh Diſputants in the World, if they had not brought the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation* to prove their *Hereſy*.

*P.* Methinks you are very long upon this Argument; when ſhall we have done at this rate?

*Pr.* I take this for your beſt Anſwer; and ſo I proceed to a ſecond *Argument*, which I am ſure will not hold againſt the *Trinity*; and that is from *the natural and inſeparable Properties of Chriſt's Body*; which are utterly inconſiſtent with the belief of *Tranſubſtantiation*. And the force of the Argument in general lies in this, That the Fathers did attribute ſuch things to the Body of Chriſt, which render it uncapable of being preſent in ſuch a manner in the Sacrament as *Tranſubſtantiation* ſuppoſes. And no Men who underſtand themſelves, will aſſert that at one time, which they muſt be bound to deny at another; but they will be ſure to make an Exception or Limitation, which may reconcile both together. As if you ſhould ſay, *That the Body of Chriſt cannot be in more places than one at once, upon the Doctrine of St.* Thomas; ye would preſently add, with regard to the Sacrament, i. e. *not in regard*

*of its natural Preſence, but in a Sacramental it may:* So, if the Fathers had an Opinion like yours as to the Body of Chriſt, they would have a Reſerve, or Exception, as to the Sacrament. But it appears by their Writings, that they attribute ſuch *Properties* in general to the *Body* of Chriſt, as overthrow any ſuch Preſence, without Exceptions or Limitations. But that is not all: For I ſhall now prove,

1. That they do attribute *Circumſcription* to *Chriſt's Body in Heaven*, ſo as to exclude the poſſibility of its being upon Earth.

2. That they deny any ſuch thing, as *the ſupernatural Exiſtence of a Body after the manner of a Spirit.*

*P.* What do you mean? I am quite tired already; and now you are turning up the other Glaſs.

*Pr.* Since you will be dabling in theſe Controverſies, you muſt not think to eſcape ſo eaſily. I have been not a little offended at the Inſolence of ſome late *Pamphlets* upon this Argument; and now I come to *cloſe Reaſoning*, you would fain be gone.

*P.* I am in a little haſte at preſent; I pray come quickly to the Point.

*Pr.* As ſoon as you pleaſe. What think you, if a Man now ſhould bring an Argument to prove a matter of Faith from hence, *That Chriſt's Body could not be in Heaven and Earth at once*, would this argument hold good? Yet thus *Vigilius Tapſitanus* argues againſt thoſe who denied two Natures in Chriſt; for, ſaith he, *The Body of Chriſt when it was on Earth, was not in Heaven; and now it is in Heaven, it is not upon Earth; and it is ſo far from being ſo, that we expect him to come from Heaven in his Fleſh, whom we believe to be now preſent on Earth by his Divinity.* How can this hold; if the Body of Chriſt can be in Heaven and Earth at the ſame time?

Nam quando in terra fuit, non erat ubiq; in Cœlo. Et nunc quia in Cœlo eſt, non eſt ubiq; in terra, & in tantum non eſt, ut ſecundùm ipſam (Carnem) Chriſtum ſpectemus eſſe venturum de Cœlo, quem ſecundùm verbum nobiſcum eſſe credimus in terra. *Cont. Eutych. l. 4. n. 14.*

*P.* He ſpeaks this of the *Natural Preſence* of Chriſt's Body, and not of *the Sacramental.*

*Pr.* The Argument is not drawn from the *manner* of the *Preſence*, but from the *Nature* of a *Body*, that it could not be in Heaven and Earth at the ſame time. And ſo St. *Auguſtin* ſaid, *That Chriſt was every where preſent as God; but confined to a certain place in Heaven according to the Meaſure of his true Body.*

Et ubique totum præſentem eſſe non dubites tanquam Deum——& in loco aliquo Cœli propter veri Corporis modum. Ad Dardan.

*P.* This is only to diſprove the *Ubiquity* of Chriſt's Body; and not his being in ſeveral places at the ſame time.

*Pr.* Then you yield it to be repugnant to the *Nature* of a *Body* to be *every where preſent.*

*P.* Yes.

*Pr.* But what if there be as great a repugnancy from St. *Auguſtin*'s Argument, for a *Body to be preſent in ſeveral places at once?*

*P.* I ſee no ſuch thing.

*Pr.* No? His Argument is from the *Confinement* of a true Body to a certain place. And if it be *in many places at once*, it is as far from being *confined*, as if it took up all places. And there are ſome greater Difficulties as to a Body's being *diſtant from it ſelf*, than in aſſerting its *Ubiquity.*

*P.* I perceive you are inclined to be a *Lutheran.*

*Pr.* No

*Pr.* No ſuch matter. For I think the Eſſential Properties of a Finite and Infinite Being are incommunicable to each other, and I look on *Ubiquity* as one of them.

*P.* Then the ſame Argument will not hold as to *Preſence in ſeveral places*, for this is no *Infinite Perfection.*

*Pr.* You run from one Argument to another. For theſe are two diſtinct ways of arguing; and the Argument from the *Repugnancy* of it to the Nature of a Body, doth as well hold againſt *Ubiquity*, as that it is a *Divine Perfection.* And St. *Auguſtin* in that excellent Epiſtle doth argue from the *Eſſential Properties* and *Dimenſions* of Bodies, and the difference of the *Preſence* of a *Spirit*, and *a Body.* I pray read and conſider that Epiſtle, and you will think it impoſſible St. *Auguſtin* ſhould believe *Tranſubſtantiation.*

*P.* St. *Auguſtin* was a great Diſputant, and ſuch are wont while they are eager upon one Point, to forget another. But St. *Auguſtin* elſewhere doth aſſert the *Preſence of Chriſt's real Body* in the *Sacrament.*

*Pr.* Then the plain Conſequence is, that he contradicted himſelf.

*P.* But he doth not ſpeak of a *Sacramental Preſence.*

*Pr.* What again? But St. *Auguſtin* makes this an eſſential difference between a *Divine and Corporal Preſence*; that *the one doth not fill places by its Dimenſions as the other doth*; ſo that Bodies cannot be in diſtant places at once. What think you of this?

Non enim Corporum ſunt quorum ampliùs ſit in tribus quam in ſingulis magnitudo, nec loca ſuis molibus tenent, ut diſtantibus ſpatiis ſimul eſſe non poſſint. Ad Dardan.

*P.* I pray go on.

*Pr.* What think you of the *Manichees* Doctrine, who held *that Chriſt was in the Sun and Moon when he ſuffered on the Croſs?* Was this poſſible or not?

*P.* What would you draw from hence?

*Pr.* Nothing more, but that St. *Auguſtin* diſproved it, *becauſe his Body could not be at the ſame time in the Sun and Moon, and upon Earth?*

Secundum præſentiam verò coporalem ſimul & in Sole & in Luna & in Cruce eſſe non poſſet. *C. Fauſt. l.* 20. *c.* 11.

*P.* As to the *ordinary courſe of Nature*, St. *Auguſtin*'s Argument holds, but not as to the *Miraculous Power of God.*

*Pr.* There is a difference between the *ordinary Courſe of Nature*, and the *unchangeable order of Nature*,

*P.* Let me hear this again; for it is new Doctrine to us.

*Pr.* That's ſtrange! Thoſe things are by the *ordinary Courſe of Nature*, which cannot be changed but by Divine Power; but imply no Repugnancy for God to alter that Courſe; but thoſe are by the *unchangeable Order of Nature*, which cannot be done without overthrowing the very Nature of the things; and ſuch things are impoſſible in themſelves, and therefore God himſelf cannot do them.

*P.* It ſeems then you ſet Bounds to *God's Omnipotency.*

*Pr.* Doth not the *Scripture* ſay, *there are ſome things impoſſible for God to do?*

*P.* Yes; ſuch as are repugnant to *his own Perfections*; as *it is impoſſible for God to lye.*

*Pr.* But are there no other things impoſſible to be done? What think you of making the time paſt not to be paſt?

*P.* That is impoſſible in it ſelf.

*Pr.* But is it not impoſſible for the ſame Body to be in two different times?

*P.* Yes.

*Pr.* Why not then in two or more different Places; ſince a Body is as certainly confined, as to Place, as it is to Time?

*P.* You are run now into the Point of Reaſon, when we were upon St. *Auguſtin*'s Teſtimony.

*Pr.* But I ſay, St. *Auguſtin* went upon this ground, that it was repugnant to the *Nature* of a Body to be in more places than one at the ſame time. And ſo likewiſe *Caſſian* proves, *That when Chriſt was upon Earth he could not be in Heaven, but in regard of his Divinity.* Is there not the ſame Repugnancy for *a Body in Heaven to be upon Earth*, as for *a Body upon Earth to be in Heaven?*

Et cum in Terra loquitur in Cœlo utiq; niſi per Dei Infinitatem eſſe non poſſit. *De Incar. l. 4. c. 6.*

*P.* Theſe are new Queſtions, which I have not met with in our Writers, and therefore I ſhall take time to anſwer them. But all theſe Teſtimonies proceed upon a Body conſidered under the *Nature of a Body*; but in the Sacrament we conſider *Chriſt's Body as preſent after the manner of a Spirit.*

*Pr.* That was the next thing I promiſed to prove from the *Fathers*, that they knew of no ſuch thing, and therefore could not believe your Doctrine. Have you obſerved what the *Fathers* ſay about the difference of *Body and Spirit?*

*P.* Not I; but I have read our Authors, who produce them for our Doctrine.

*Pr.* That is the perpetual fault of your Writers, to attend more to the *ſound* of their *Words*, than to the *force* of their *Reaſonings*. They bring places out of *Popular Diſcourſes* intended to heighten the Peoples Devotion, and never compare them with thoſe *Principles* which they aſſert, when they come to Reaſoning; which would plainly ſhew their other Expreſſions are to be underſtood in a *Myſtical* and *Figurative Senſe*. But I pray tell me, do you think the *Fathers* had no diſtinct Notion of a *Body* and *Spirit*, and the Eſſential *Properties* of both?

*P.* Yes doubtleſs.

*Pr.* Suppoſe then they made thoſe to lye in ſuch things as are inconſiſtent with *the Preſence of Chriſt's Body in the Sacrament after the manner of a Spirit:* do you think then they could hold it to be ſo preſent? And if they did not, they could not believe *Tranſubſtantiation.*

*P.* Very true.

*Pr.* What think you then of St. *Auguſtin*, who makes it impoſſible for a Body to be without its Dimenſions and Extenſion of Parts? But you aſſert a Body may be without them; or elſe it cannot be after *the manner of a Spirit*, as you ſay it is in the Sacrament.

*P.* I pray ſhew that St. *Auguſtin* made it inconſiſtent with the Nature of a Body to be otherwiſe.

*Pr.* He ſaith, *That all Bodies how groſs or ſubtle ſoever they be, can never be all every where* (*i. e.* cannot be indiviſibly preſent after the manner of a Spirit) *but muſt be extended according to their ſeveral Parts, and whether great or little, muſt take up a ſpace, and ſo fill the Place, that it cannot be all in any one Part.* Is this poſſible to be reconciled with your Notion of a *Body* being preſent after *the manner of a Spirit?*

Sive iſta craſſiora, ſive ſubtiliora, ſed tamen Corpora, quorum nullum poteſt eſſe ubique totum, quoniam per innumerabiles partes aliud alibi habeat neceſſe eſt. Et quantumcumq; ſit Corpus, ſeu quantulumcunque corpuſculum, loci occupet ſpatium, eundemque locum ſic impleat, ut in nullâ ejus parte ſit totum. Ad Voluſian.

*P.* To be present after the manner of a Spirit, is with us, to be so present, as *not to be extended*, and to *be whole in every part.*

*Pr.* But this St. *Austin* saith, *no Body can be*; and not only there but elsewhere he saith, *Take away Dimensions from Bodies, and they are no longer Bodies. And that a greater part takes away greater space, and a lesser a less; and must be always less in the part than in the whole.*

Quanquam si hoc demas Corporibus, quantum mea opino est, neq; sentiri possunt, neque omnino Corpora esse rectè existimarem. De Quant. Animæ, c. 4.

Quod per loci spatium aliqua longitudine, latitudine, altitudine ita sistitur vel movetur, ut majore sui parte majorem locum occupet, & breviore breviorem, minusq; sit in parte quam in toto. Ad Hieron. Ep. 166.

*P.* But he speaks of *Extension in it self*, and not with respect to *Place.*

*Pr.* That is of *Extension* that is *not extended*; for if it be, it must have respect *to Place*; but nothing can be plainer, than that St. *Austin* doth speak *with respect to Place.* And he elsewhere saith, *That every Body must have Place, and be extended in it.*

Non Omnino potest esse aliquod Corpus, sive Cœleste, sive Terrestre, sive Aereum, sive humidum, quod non minus sit in parte quam in toto, neque ullo modo possit in loco hujus partis simul habere aliam partem, sed aliud hic aliud alibi habens per quælibet spatia locorum distantia & dividua, vel potius ut ita dicam, sectili more distenditur. C. Epist. Manich. c. 16.

Omne Corpus locale est, & omne locale Corpus est. 83 Quest. c. 35.

Corpus quodlibet per localia spatia porrectum est. 83. Quæst. c. 51.

*P.* But he doth not speak this of the *Sacrament.*

*Pr.* But he speaks it of all *Bodies whereſoever present*; and he doth not except *the Sacrament*, which he would certainly have done, if he had believed as you do concerning it.

*P.* St. *Augustin* might have particular Opinions in this, as he had in other things.

*Pr.* So far from it, that I shall make it appear, that this was the general *Sense* of the *Fathers.* St. *Gregory Nazianzen* saith, *That the Nature of Bodies requires, that they have Figure and Shape, and may be touched, and seen, and circumscribed.* St. *Cyril* of *Alexandria* saith, *That if God himself were a Body, he must be liable to the Properties of Bodies, and he must be in a place, as Bodies are.* And all those Fathers, who prove, that *God* cannot be a *Body*, do it from such Arguments as shew, that they knew nothing of a *Body*'s Being after *the manner of a Spirit*: For then the force of their Arguments is lost, which are taken from the *Essential Properties* of a Body, such as *Extension*, *Divisibility*, and *Circumscription.* But if a Body may be without these, then God may be *a Body after the manner of a Spirit*; and so the *Spirituality* of the *Divine Nature* will be taken away.

Orat. 34. & in Ep. ad Cledon. Dial 2. de Trin.

*P.* I never heard these Arguments before, and must take some time to consider.

*Pr.* The sooner the better; and I am sure if you do, you will repent being a *New Convert.* But I have yet something to add to this Argument; *viz.* That those who have stated the Difference between *Body* and *Spirit*, have made *Extension, and taking up a place, and Divisibility, necessary to the very Being of a Body*; and *that what is not circumscribed, is incorporeal.*

Claud Mamert. de Statu Animæ, l. 1. c. 5. 17, 18. l. 3. c. 14.

*P.* Methinks your Arguments run out to a great length. I pray, bring them into a less Compass.

*Pr.* I proceed to a Third Argument from the *Fathers*, which will not take up much time; and that is, That the Fathers knew nothing of the *Subsistence of Accidents without their Substance*, without which *Transubstantiation* cannot be maintained: And therefore in the *Roman Schools*, the

the *possibility* of *Accidents* subsisting without their *Subjects*, is defended. But on the contrary, *Maximus*, one of the eldest of the Fathers, who lived in the Second Century, affirms it *to be of the Essence of Accidents to be in their Substance.* St. *Basil* saith, *Nature doth not bear a distinction between Body and Figure, altho' Reason makes one.*

Apud Euseb. de Præp. Evangel. l. 7. c. 22.

Basil. Epist. 43.

*Isidore Peluſiota*, saith, *That Quality cannot be without Substance.*

Isidor. Epist l. 2. Ep. 72.

*Gregory Nyssen*, That *Figure cannot be without Body, and that a Body cannot be conceived without Qualities: And that if we take away Colour, and Quantity, and Resistance; the whole Notion of a Body is destroy'd. Take away Space from Bodies*, saith St. *Augustin*, *and they can be no where; and if they can be no where, they cannot be:* And so he saith, *if we take away Bodies from their Qualities.* And in plain terms, *That no Qualities, as Colours, or Form, can remain without their Subject.*

Greg. Nyssen. in Hexaem. p. 13. De Hom. Opificio. c. 24.

Aug. Ep. ad Dardanum cont. Julian. l. 5. c. 9.

And *that no Accidents can be without their Subject*, is in general affirmed by *Isidore Hispalensis*, *Boethius*, *Damascen*, and others, who give an Account of the Philosophy of the Ancients.

Isid. Origin. l. 2. c. 26. Boeth. de Prædic. Damascen. Dial. c. 1. Alcuin. Dial. c. 5, 12.

*P.* All this proceeds upon the *old Philosophy* of *Accidents:* What if there be none at all?

*Pr.* What then makes the *same Impression* on our Senses when the *Substance* is gone, as when it was there? Is there a perpetual Miracle to deceive our Senses? But it is impossible to maintain *Transubstantiation*, as it is defined in the Church of *Rome*, without *Accidents:* They may hold some other Doctrine in the place of it, but they cannot hold that. And that other Doctrine will be as impossible to be understood. For if once we suppose the Body of Christ to be in the Sacrament, in place of the *Substance of the Bread*, which appears to our Senses to be Bread still: Then suppose there be *no Accidents*, the *Body* of a *Man* must make the same Impression on our *Senses*, which the *Substance* of Bread doth, which is so horrible an Absurdity, that the *Philosophy* of *Accidents* cannot imply any greater than it. So that the New *Transubstantiators* had as good return to the Old *Mumpsimus* of *Accidents.*

*P.* I suppose you have now done with this Argument.

*Pr.* No: I have something farther to say about it, which is, that the Fathers do not only assert, *That Accidents cannot be without their Subject*, but they confute *Hereticks* on that Supposition; which shew'd their assurance of the Truth of it.

Iren. l. 2. c. 14.

*Irenæus* overthrows the *Valentinian Conjugations*, *because Truth can no more be without a Subject, than Water without Moisture, or Fire without Heat, or a Stone without Hardness; which are so joined together, that they cannot be separated.*

Apud. Phot. cod. 234.

*Methodius* confutes *Origen*'s Fancy about the Soul having the Shape of a Body without the Substance, *because the Shape and the Body cannot be separated from each other.*

Aug. de Immort. Anim. c. 10. Soliloq. l. 2. c. 13.

St. *Augustin* proves the *Immortality* of the *Soul* from hence, *because mere Accidents can never be separated from the Body, so as the mind is by abstraction.* And in another place he asserts it to be a *monstrous absurd Doctrine, to suppose that, whose Nature is to be in a Subject, to be capable of subsisting without it.*

De Statu Anim. l. 3. c. 3.

*Claudianus Mamertus* proves, *That the Soul could not be in the Body as its Subject; for then it could not subsist when the Body is destroy'd.*

*P.* I hope you have now done with this Third Argument.

*Pr.* Yes; and I shall wait your own time for an Answer. I go on to a Fourth: And that is from *the Evidence of Sense* asserted and allowed by *the Fathers*, with respect to the Body of Christ.

*P.* I

*P.* I expected this before now. For, as the Author of the *Single Sheet* obſerves: *This is the Cock-Argument of one of the Lights of your Church; and it ſo far reſembles the Light, that like it, it makes a glaring ſhew, but go to graſp it, and you find nothing in your hand.*

*Pr.* Then it's plain our Senſes are deceived.

*P.* Not as to *Tranſubſtantiation:* for *he believes more of his Senſes than we do: for his Eyes tell him there is the Colour of Bread, and he aſſents to them; his Tongue, that it has the Taſte of Bread, and he agrees to it: and ſo for his Smelling and Feeling:* But then he hath a notable fetch in his Concluſion: viz. *That his Ears tell him from the Words ſpoken by Chriſt himſelf, that it is the Body of Chriſt, and he believes theſe too. Is not here one Senſe more than you believe? and yet you would perſuade the World, that we do not believe our Senſes.*

*Pr.* This is admirable ſtuff; but it muſt be tenderly dealt with: For, I pray, what doth he mean when he ſaith, *he believes from Chriſt's own words, that it is the Body of Chriſt?* what is this *It?* Is it the *Accidents* he ſpeaks of before? Are thoſe *Accidents* then *the Body of Chriſt?* Is it the *Subſtance of Bread?* But *that is not diſcerned by the Senſes,* he ſaith, and if it were, will he ſay, that the ſubſtance of Bread is the Body of Chriſt? if neither of theſe, then his believing *It is the Body of Chriſt,* ſignifies nothing, for there can be no ſenſe of *it.*

*P.* However, he ſhews, *That we who believe Tranſubſtantiation, do not renounce our Senſes, as you commonly reproach us;* for we believe all that our Senſes repreſent to us, which is only the outward appearance. *For,* as he well obſerves, *if your Eyes ſee the ſubſtance of things, they are moſt extraordinary ones, and better than ours. For our parts, we ſee no farther than the Colour or Figure, &c. of things, which are only Accidents, and the entire object of that Senſe.*

*Pr.* Is there no difference between the *Perception* of *Senſe,* and the *Evidence* of *Senſe?* We grant, that the *Perception* of our Senſes goes no farther than to the *outward Accidents;* but that *Perception* affords ſuch an *Evidence* by which the Mind doth paſs Judgment upon the thing repreſented by the outward Senſe. I pray tell me, have you any *certainty* there is ſuch a thing as a *material Subſtance* in the world?

*P.* Yes.

*Pr.* Whence comes the certainty of the *Subſtance,* ſince your Senſes cannot diſcover it? Do we live among nothing but *Accidents?* Or can we know nothing beyond them?

*P.* I grant we may know in general that there are ſuch things as *Subſtances* in the World.

*Pr.* But can we not know the difference of *one Subſtance* from another, by our Senſes? As for inſtance, can we not know a Man from a Horſe, or an Elephant from a Mouſe, or a piece of Bread from a Church? Or do we only know there are ſuch and ſuch *Accidents* belong to every one of theſe; but our Senſes are not ſo *extraordinary* to diſcover the *Subſtances* under them? I pray anſwer me one Queſtion, Did you ever keep *Lent?*

*P.* What a ſtrange Queſtion is this? Did you not tell me, you would avoid Impertinencies?

*Pr.* This is none, I aſſure you.

*P.* Then I anſwer, I think my ſelf obliged to keep it.

*Pr.* Then you thought your ſelf bound to abſtain from *Fleſh,* and to eat *Fiſh.*

*P.* What of all that?

*Pr.* Was it the *Subſtance* of *Fleſh* you abſtained from, or only the *Accidents* of it?

*P.* The *Subſtance.*

*Pr.* And did you know the difference between the *Subſtance* of *Fleſh* and *Fiſh* by your *Taſte?*

*P.* Yes.

*Pr.* Then you have an *extraordinary Taſte*, which goes to the *very Subſtance?*

*P.* But this is off from our buſineſs, which was about the *Fathers*, and not our own *Judgment*, about the evidence of *Senſe.*

*Pr.* I am ready for you upon that Argument. And I only deſire to know whether you think the *Evidence of Senſe* ſufficient, as to the *true Body of Chriſt*, where it is ſuppoſed to be preſent.

*P.* By no means, for then we could not believe it to be preſent, where we cannot perceive it.

Iren. l. 3. 20. 5. 7. Terrul. de Carne Chriſti, c. 5. Adverſ. Marc. l. 4. c. 43. l. 3. c. 8, 11. Epiphan. hær. 42, 64. Hilar. in Pſal. 137. Aug. c. Fauſt. l. 29. c. 2. l. 14. c. 10. 83 Quæſt. c. 14. Serm. 238.

*Pr.* But the Fathers did aſſert the Evidence of Senſe to be ſufficient, as to the true Body of Chriſt; ſo *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, *Epiphanius*, *Hilary*, and St. *Auguſtin.* I will produce their Words at length, if you deſire them.

De Euch. l. 1. c. 14.

*P.* It will be but loſt labour, ſince we deny not, as Cardinal *Bellarmin* well ſaith, *The Evidence of Senſe to be a good poſitive Evidence, but not a negative*, i. e. that it is a Body, which is handled, and felt, and ſeen; but not, that it is no Body which is not.

*Pr.* Very well! And I pray then what becomes of your *ſingle Sheet Man*, who ſo confidently denies *Senſe* to be good *poſitive Evidence* as to a *real Body*; but only as to the *outward appearance?*

*P.* You miſtake him; for he ſaith, *We are to believe our Senſes, where they are not indiſpoſed, and no Divine Revelation intervenes*, which we believe there doth in this Caſe; and therefore, unleſs the Fathers ſpeak of the Sacrament, we have no reaſon to regard their Teſtimonies in this matter. But we have ſtronger Evidence againſt you from the Fathers, for they ſay, we are not to rely on the Evidence of Senſe, as to the Sacrament. So St. *Cyril*, St. *Chryſoſtom*, and St. *Ambroſe.*

*Pr.* I am glad you offer any thing which deſerves to be conſidered. But you have already forgot *Bellarmin*'s Rule, That *Senſe* may be a *good poſitive Evidence*, but not a *negative*, *i. e.* it may diſcover what is preſent as a Body, but not what is not, and cannot be ſo preſent, *viz.* the *inviſible Grace* which goes along with it; and as to this the *Fathers* might well ſay, *we are not to truſt our Senſe.*

*P.* This is making an Interpretation for them.

*Pr.* No ſuch matter. It is the proper and genuine Senſe of their Words, as will appear from hence.

Cyril Myſtag. 3, & 4, 5. Catech. 3. Chryſoſt. in Mat. hom. 83. Ambr. de his qui initiantur, c. 9.

(1.) They aſſert the very ſame, as to the *Chriſm*, and *Baptiſm*, which they do as to the *Euchariſt.*

(2.) That which they ſay, our *Senſes* cannot reach, is ſomething of a *ſpiritual Nature*, and not a *Body.* And here the Caſe is extremely different from the Judgment of Senſe, as to a material *Subſtance.* And if you pleaſe, I will evidently prove from the Fathers, that that wherein they excluded the Judgment of Senſe in the Euchariſt, was ſomething wholly *Spiritual* and *Immaterial.*

*P.* No,

*P.* No, no, we have been long enough upon the *Fathers*, unleſs their evidence were more certain one way or other. For my part, I believe on the account of Divine Revelation in this matter, *This is my Body*; here I ſtick, and the Fathers agreed with us herein, that Chriſt's words are not to be taken in a figurative Senſe.

*Pr.* The contrary hath been ſo plainly proved in a late excellent Diſcourſe of *Tranſubſtantiation*, that I wonder none of your Party have yet undertaken to anſwer it; but they write on, as if no ſuch Treatiſe had appear'd: I ſhall therefore wave all the Proofs that are there produced, till ſome tolerable Anſwer be given to them.

*P.* Methinks you have taken a great liberty of talking about the *Fathers*, as tho' they were all on your ſide; but our late Authors aſſure us to the contrary, and I hope I may now make uſe of them, to ſhew that *Tranſubſtantiation* was *the Faith of the ancient Church.*

*Pr.* With all my heart, I even long to hear what they can ſay in a matter, I think, ſo clear on our ſide.

*P.* Well, Sir, I begin with the *Conſenſus Veterum*, written by one that profeſſed himſelf a *Miniſter* of the *Church* of *England.*

*Pr.* Make what you can of him, now you have him, but I will meddle with no perſonal Things: I deſire to hear his Arguments.

*P.* What ſay you to *R. Selomo*, interpreting the 72 Pſal. *v.* 16. *of Wafers in the days of the Meſſias*; *to* R. Moſes Haddarſan, *on* Gen. 39. 1. *and on* Pſal. 136. 25. *to* R. Cahana, *on* Gen. 49. 1. *who was long before the Nativity of* Chriſt; R. Johai, *on* Numb. 28. 2. *and to* R. Judas, *who was many years before* Chriſt *came.* Conſenſus Veterum, p. 21, 22, 23.

*P.* Can you hold your Countenance when you repeat theſe things? But any thing muſt paſs from a *New Convert.* What think you of *R. Cahana*, and *R. Judas*, who lived ſo long before our Saviour, when we know that the *Jews* have no Writings preſerved near to our Saviour's time, beſides the Bible, and ſome ſay the *Paraphraſts* upon it. I would have been glad to have ſeen theſe Teſtimonies taken from their original Authors, and not from *Galatinus*, who is known to have been a *notorious Plagiary*, as to the main of his Book, and of little or no credit as to the reſt. But it is ridiculous to produce the Teſtimonies of *Jewiſh Rabbins* for *Tranſubſtantiation*, when it is ſo well known that it is one of their greateſt objections againſt *Chriſtianity*, as taught in the *Roman* Church, as may be ſeen in *Joſeph Albo*, and others. But what is all this to the Teſtimony of the *Chriſtian Fathers?*

*P.* Will not you let a Man ſhew a little *Jewiſh Learning* upon occaſion? But if you have a mind to the Fathers, you ſhall have enough of them, for I have a large Catalogue of them to produce, from the *Conſenſus Veterum*, *Nubes Teſtium*, and the *ſingle Sheet*, which generally agree.

*Pr.* With *Coccius* or *Bellarmin*, you mean; but before you produce them, I pray tell me what you intend to prove by them?

*P.* The Doctrine of our Church.

*Pr.* As to what?

*P.* What have we been about all this while?

*Pr. Tranſubſtantiation.* Will you prove that?

*P.* Why do you ſuſpect me before I begin?

*Pr.* I have ſome reaſon for it. Let us firſt agree what we mean by it. Do you mean the ſame which the Church of *Rome* doth by it, in the *Council* of *Trent?*

*P.* What can we mean elſe?

*Pr.* Let us firſt ſee what that is: The Council of *Trent* declares, *That the ſame Body of Chriſt which is in Heaven, is really, truly and ſubſtantially preſent in the Euchariſt after Conſecration, under the Species of Bread and Wine.* And the *Roman Catechiſm* ſaith, *It is the very Body which was born of the Virgin, and ſits at the right hand of God.* (2.) *That the Bread and Wine after Conſecration, loſe their proper Subſtances, and are changed into that very Subſtance of the Body of Chriſt.* And an *Anathema* is denounced againſt thoſe who affirm the contrary. Now if you pleaſe, proceed to your Proofs.

Conſenſus Veterum, p. 27.

*P.* I begin with the *ancient Liturgies of St.* Peter, *St.* James, *and St.* Matthew.

*Pr.* Are you in earneſt?

*P.* Why; what is the matter?

*Pr.* Do not you know, that theſe are rejected as *ſuppoſititious*, by your own Writers? And a very late and learned Dr. of the *Sorbon*, hath given full and clear Evidences of it.

*Nouvelle Bibliotheq. des Anciennes Eccleſiaſtiques par Ellies du Pin*, 1686.

*P.* Suppoſe they are, *yet they may be of Antiquity enough, to give ſome competent Teſtimony as to Tradition.*

*Pr.* No ſuch matter: For he proves *St.* Peter's *Liturgy* to be later than the *Sacramentary of St.* Gregory; and ſo can prove nothing for the firſt 600 *years*; and the *Æthiopick Liturgy*, or St. *Matthew*'s, he ſhews to be very late. That of St. *James*, he thinks to have been ſome time before the Five *General Councils*; but by no means to have been St. *James*'s.

P. 22.

P. 23.

*P.* What think you of the *Acts of St.* Andrew, and what he ſaith therein, *about eating the Fleſh of Chriſt?*

Conſenſ. p. 30.

*Pr.* I think he ſaith nothing to the purpoſe. But I am aſhamed to find one, who hath ſo long been a Miniſter in this Church, ſo extremely ignorant, as to bring theſe for good *Authorities*, which are rejected with ſcorn by all Men of Learning and Ingenuity among you.

*P.* I am afraid you grow angry.

*Pr.* I confeſs, *Ignorance* and *Confidence* together, are very provoking things, eſpecially when a Man in years pretends to leave our Church on ſuch pitiful Grounds.

*P.* But he doth produce better *Authorities.*

*Pr.* If he doth, they are not to his purpoſe.

*P.* That muſt be tried: What ſay you to *Ignatius?* I hope you allow his *Epiſtles?*

*Pr.* I ſee no reaſon to the contrary. But what ſaith he?

Conſenſus Veterum, p. 30. Nubes Teſtium, p. 109.

*P.* He ſaith, *That ſome Hereticks then would not receive the Euchariſt and Oblations, becauſe they will not confeſs the Euchariſt to be the Fleſh of our Saviour Chriſt:* And this is produced by both Authors.

*Pr.* The Perſons *Ignatius* ſpeaks of, were ſuch as denied Chriſt to have *any true Body*, and therefore did forbear the *Euchariſt*, becauſe it was ſaid to be *his Body:* And in what ever ſenſe it were taken, it ſtill ſuppoſed that which they denied, *viz.* that he had a true Body: For, if it were figuratively underſtood, it was as contrary to their Doctrine, as as if it were literally: For a *Figure* muſt relate to a *real Body*, as *Tertullian* argued in this caſe; and *Ignatius* in the ſame *Epiſtle*, mentions the trial Chriſt made of his true Body, by the Senſes of his Diſciples, *Take hold of me, and handle me, and ſee, for I am no incorporeal Dæmon; and immediately they touched him, and were convinced:* Which hap-

Tertul. c. Marcion. l. 4. c. 40.

pen'd

pen'd but a few days after Chriſt had ſaid, *This is my Body*; and our Saviour gave a Rule for judging a true Body, from an appearance, or ſpiritual Subſtance; *A Spirit hath not Fleſh and Bones, as ye ſee me have.* Therefore it is very improbable that *Ignatius* ſo ſoon after, ſhould aſſert that Chriſt's true and real Body was in the Euchariſt, where it could be neither ſeen nor felt: For then he muſt overthrow the force of his former Argument. And to what purpoſe did Chriſt ſay, *That a Spirit had not Fleſh and Bones, as they ſaw him to have*; if a Body of Chriſt might be ſo much after the *manner of a Spirit*, as tho' it had Fleſh and Bones, yet they could not poſſibly be diſcerned? But, after all, ſuppoſe *Ignatius* doth ſpeak of the ſubſtance of Chriſt's Fleſh, as preſent in the *Euchariſt*; yet he ſaith not a word of the *changing of the ſubſtance* of the Bread into the *ſubſtance of Chriſt's Body*, which was the thing to be proved.

*P.* But *Juſtin Martyr* doth ſpeak of the change, and his words are produced by all three; and they are thus rendred in the ſingle Sheet: *For we do not receive this as common Bread, or common Drink, but as by the Word of God, Jeſus Chriſt our Redeemer being made Man, had both Fleſh and Blood for our Salvation; ſo alſo, we are taught that this Food, by which our Blood and Fleſh are by a change nouriſhed, being conſecrated by the power of the Word, is the Fleſh and Blood of Jeſus Chriſt incarnate:* What ſay you to this? Apol. 2.

*Pr.* I deſire you to conſider theſe things: (1.) That *Juſtin Martyr* doth not ſay, That the Bread and Wine are by Conſecration changed into the *individual Fleſh and Blood, in which Chriſt was incarnate*; but that, *as by the power of the Word, Chriſt once had a Body in the Womb of the Virgin; ſo by the power of the ſame Word, upon Conſecration, the Bread and Wine do become the Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt incarnate*; ſo that he muſt mean a *parallel*, and not the *ſame individual Body*, i. e. that as the *Body* in the *Womb* became the *Body of Chriſt* by the *power of the Holy Spirit*, ſo the *Holy Spirit* after Conſecration, makes the Elements to become the Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt, not by an *Hypoſtatical Union*, but by *Divine Influence*, as *the Church is the Body of Chriſt*: And this was the true Notion of the ancient Church, as to this matter, and the Expreſſions in the *Greek Liturgies* to this day confirm the ſame. (2.) He doth not in the leaſt imply that the *Elements* by this change do loſe their *ſubſtance*; for he mentions *the nouriſhment of our Bodies by it*; but he affirms, that notwithſtanding their ſubſtance remain, yet the *Divine Spirit of Chriſt, by its operation, doth make them become his Body*: For we muſt obſerve, that he attributes *the Body in the Womb*, and *on the Altar*, to the ſame λόγος, or *Divine Word*; for he did not think *Hypoſtatical Union* neceſſary, to make the Elements become *the Body of Chriſt*, but a *Divine Energy* was ſufficient, as the *Bodies* aſſumed by *Angels* are their *Bodies*, tho' there be no ſuch *vital Union*, as there is between the *Soul* and *Body of a Man.*

*P.* I go on to *Irenæus*, from whom two places are produced, one by the *Conſenſus Veterum*, where he ſaith, *That which is Bread from the Earth, perceiving the call of God, now is not common Bread, but the Euchariſt, conſiſting of two things, one Earthly, and the other Spiritual.* P. 31. Iren. l. 4. c. 34.

*Pr.* Very well! Then there is an *Earthly*, as well as a *Spiritual thing* in the *Euchariſt*, i. e. a *Bodily Subſtance*, and *Divine Grace.*

*P.* No; he ſaith, *The Earthly is the Accidents.*

*Pr.* Doth *Irenæus* ſay ſo?

*P.* No, but he means ſo.

*P.* There is not a word to that purpoſe in *Irenæus*, and therefore this is downright prevarication: I grant *Irenæus* doth ſuppoſe a *change* made by *Divine Grace*; but not by *deſtroying the Elements*, but by *ſuper-adding Divine Grace* to them, and ſo the *Bread* becomes the *Body of Chriſt*, and the *Wine his Blood.*

Iren. l. 5. c. 11. *P.* The other place in *Irenæus* is, where he ſaith, *That as the Bread receiving the Word of God, is made the Euchariſt, which is the Body and Blood of Chriſt, ſo alſo our Bodies being nouriſhed by it, and laid in the Earth, and there diſſolved, will ariſe at their time*, &c.

*Pr.* What do you prove from this place?

*P.* That *the ſame Divine Power is ſeen in making the Euchariſt the Body and Blood of Chriſt, which is to be in the Reſurrection of the Body.*

*Pr.* But doth this prove, that *the Subſtance* of the *Bread* is changed into *the Subſtance of Chriſt's Body?*

*P.* Why not?

*Pr.* I will give you a plain Argument againſt it; for he ſaith, *Our Bodies are nouriſhed by the Body and Blood of Chriſt.* Do you think that *Irenæus* believed the *ſubſtance of Chriſt's Body* was turned into the *ſubſtance of our Bodies*, in order to their nouriſhment? No; he explained himſelf juſt before in the ſame place; *De Calice qui eſt ſanguis ejus, nutritur; & de pane qui eſt corpus ejus, augetur:* So that he attributes *the nouriſhment* to *the Bread and Wine*, and therefore muſt ſuppoſe *the ſubſtance* of them to remain, ſince it is impoſſible a *ſubſtantial nouriſhment* ſhould be made by mere *Accidents.* And withal, obſerve, he ſaith expreſly, *That the Bread* is *the Body of Chriſt*; which your beſt Writers, (ſuch as *Bellarmin*, *Suarez*, and *Vaſquez*) ſay, *is inconſiſtent with Tranſubſtantiation.*

*P.* My next Author is *Tertullian*, who is produced by the *Conſenſus Veterum*, and the *ſingle Sheet*, but omitted by the *Nubes Teſtium*; but the other proves, *That Bread which was the Figure of Chriſt's Body in the Old Teſtament, now in the New, is changed into the real and true Body of Chriſt.*

Con. Marcion, l. 4. c. 40. *Pr.* This is a bold attempt upon *Tertullian*, to prove, that by *the Figure of Chriſt's Body*, he means his *true and real Body:* For his words are, *Acceptum panem & diſtributum Diſcipulis Corpus illum ſuum fecit, Hoc eſt Corpus meum dicendo, id eſt, Figura Corporis mei. He took the bread, and gave it to his Diſciples, and made it his Body, ſaying, This is my Body*, i. e. *this is the Figure of my Body.* How can thoſe men want Proofs, that can draw *Tranſubſtantiation* from theſe words, which are ſo plain againſt it?

*P.* You are miſtaken; *Tertullian* by *Figure* meant, *it was a Figure in the Old Teſtament*, but it was now *his real Body.*

*Pr.* You put very odd *Figures* upon *Tertullian:* I appeal to any reaſonable man, whether by the latter words he doth not explain the former? For he puts the ſenſe upon *Corpus meum*, by adding *dicendo* to them, *i. e. This is the meaning of that ſpeech*, when he calleth *the Bread his Body.*

*P.* Doth not *Tertullian* ſay, *That it had not been the Figure, unleſs it had been the Truth?*

*Pr.* This is again perverting his words, which are, *Figuratum non fuiſſet niſi veritatis eſſet Corpus, i. e.* there had been no place for *a Figure of Chriſt's Body, unleſs Chriſt had a true Body:* For he was proving againſt

againſt *Marcion*, that *Chriſt had a true Body*; and among other Arguments he produces this from *the Figure of his Body*, which he not only mentions here, but in other places; where he ſaith, *That Chriſt gave the Figure of his Body to the Bread*; which cannot relate to any *Figure* of the *Old Teſtament*. Con. Marcion. l. 3. c. 19. l. 5. c. 8.

*P.* But doth not *Tertullian* ſay afterwards, *That the Bread was the figure of Chriſt's body in the Old Teſtament?*

*Pr.* What then? He had two Deſigns againſt *Marcion*; one to prove, *that Chriſt had a true body*, which he doth here from the *figure of his body*: and the other, *that there was a Correſpondency of both Teſtaments*: and for that purpoſe he ſhews, that the *bread in* Jeremiah, *was the figure of Chriſt's body.*

*P.* But the Author of the *ſingle Sheet*, cites another place of *Tertullian*, where he ſaith, *that our fleſh feeds on the body and blood of Chriſt, that our ſoul may be filled with God.* De Reſur. c. 8.

*Pr.* By the *body and blood of Chriſt*, he means there, *the Elements, with Divine Grace* going along with them; as appears by his deſign, which is, to ſhew how *the body and ſoul are joyned together in Sacramental Rites. The fleſh is waſhed, and the ſoul is cleanſed; the fleſh is anointed, and the ſoul conſecrated; the fleſh is ſigned, and the ſoul confirmed; the fleſh hath hands laid upon it, and the ſoul enlightned; the fleſh feeds on the body and blood of Chriſt, that the ſoul may be filled with God.* Now unleſs *Tertullian* meant the Elements, the Parallel doth not proceed; for all the reſt are ſpoken of the *external Symbols*; and ſo this doth not at all contradict what he ſaith elſewhere, no more than the Paſſage in the ſecond Book *ad Uxorem* doth. For there he ſpeaks of *Chriſt, with reſpect to the inviſible Grace*, as he doth here, as to the *outward Symbols.*

*P. Clemens Alexandrinus* ſaith, *That* Melchiſedeck *gave Bread and Wine in figure of the Euchariſt.* Strom. 4.

*Pr.* And what then? What is this to *Tranſubſtantiation?*

*P. Origen* ſaith, *When you eat and drink the body and blood of our Lord, then our Lord enters under your roof, &c.* Hom. 5. in diverſ. loc.

*Pr.* Are you ſure that *Origen* ſaid this? But ſuppoſe he did, muſt he enter with *his fleſh and bones*, and not much rather by a *peculiar preſence of his Grace?* For is it not *Origen* who ſo carefully diſtinguiſhes the *Typical* and *Symbolical body of Chriſt*, from the Divine Word, and ſo expreſly mentions the *material part of the Elements after Conſecration, which paſs into the Draught, &c.* Is all this meant of the *Accidents* only? Comment. in Matth. 5.

*P.* What ſay you to St. *Cyprian de Cœna Domini?*

*Pr.* I beg your pardon, Sir; this is now known and acknowledged to be a late Author, in compariſon, and cannot come within your 600 years; and therefore is not ancient enough to be conſidered.

*P.* But in his genuine Writings he ſpeaks of *thoſe who offer'd Violence to the body and blood of our Lord in the Euchariſt.* Cypr. de lapſis.

*Pr.* And I pray what follows? That *the ſubſtance* of the *Elements* is gone: Where lies the Conſequence? But St. *Cyprian* ſaith, *the bread was his body, and the wine his blood*; therefore their *ſubſtance* muſt remain. Epiſt. 63. N. 6.

*P.* What ſay you to *Euſebius Emeſenus?*

*Pr.* That he is not within our compaſs; and withal, that he is a known Counterfeit.

*P.* I

*P.* I perceive you are hard to pleaſe?

*Pr.* You ſay very true, as to *ſuppoſititious Writers.*

*P.* I hope you have more Reverence for the *Council of Nice.*

*Pr.* But where doth that ſpeak of *Tranſubſtantiation?*

*P.* It calls the *Euchariſt the body of Chriſt.*

*Pr.* And ſo doth the *Church of England*; therefore that holds *Tranſubſtantiation.* I pray bring no more ſuch Teſtimonies, which prove nothing but what we hold.

*P.* I perceive you have a mind to cut me ſhort.

*Pr.* Not in the leaſt, where you offer any thing to the purpoſe. But I pray ſpare thoſe who only affirm, that the *Euchariſt is the body and blood of Chriſt after Conſecration.* For I acknowledge it was the Language of the Church, eſpecially in the fourth Century, when the *Names* of the *Elements* were hardly mention'd to the *Catechumens*; and all the Diſcourſes of the Fathers to them, tended to heighten the Devotion and Eſteem of the Euchariſt. By which Obſervation you may eaſily underſtand the meaning of the Eloquent Writers of that Age, who ſpeak with ſo much *Myſtery and Obſcurity* about it. If you have any that go beyond lofty Expreſſions, and Rhetorical flights, I pray produce them.

*P.* I perceive you are afraid of S. *Greg. Nazianzen*, and S. *Baſil*, but eſpecially S. *Chryſoſtom*, you fence ſo much beforehand againſt Eloquent Men.

*Pr.* As to the other two, there is nothing material alledged by any to this purpoſe; but S. *Chryſoſtom*, I confeſs, doth ſpeak very lofty things concerning the *Sacrament* in his popular Diſcourſes, but yet nothing that doth prove *Tranſubſtantiation.*

*P.* What think you of his *Homilies*, 51 *and* 83. *on S.* Mat. 46. *Homily on S.* John 24. *Homily on* 1ſt *to the* Corinth. *the Homilies on* Philogonius *and the Croſs?* Are there not ſtrange things in them concerning the Euchariſt? *About eating Chriſt, and ſeeing him lie before them ſlain on the Altar; about touching his Body there, and the Holy Spirit, with an innumerable Hoſt, hovering over what is there propoſed,* with much more to that purpoſe.

Nubes Teſtium p. 120, &c. Conſenſ. Vet. p. 54, &c.

*Pr.* You need not to recite more; for I yield that St. *Chryſoſtom* delighted in the higheſt flights of his Eloquence, on this Subject, in his *Homilies*; and he tells for what Reaſon, to excite the Reverence and Devotion of the People. But yet himſelf doth afford us a ſufficient Key to theſe expreſſions, if we attend to theſe things concerning his manner of ſpeaking:

(1.) That he affirms thoſe things which no ſide can allow to be literally underſtood. As when he ſo often ſpeaks of *our ſeeing and touching Chriſt upon the Altar*, which is inconſiſtent with the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation: For Chriſt is utterly inviſible on the Altar, even by Divine Power*, ſaith *Suarez. He is inviſible in the Sacrament*, ſaith *Bellarmin*; and he ſaith alſo, *that he cannot be touched.* What then is to be ſaid to ſuch expreſſions of S. *Chryſoſtom?*

Diſp. 53. Sect. 4. De Euch. l. 1. c. 4.

*Behold thou ſeeſt him, thou toucheſt him, thou eateſt him.*

Hom. 83. in Mat.

*It is not his Sacrament only which is offer'd us to touch, but himſelf.*

Hom. 51. in Mat.

*What if you do not hear his Voice, do you not ſee him lying before you?*

In Heb. Hom. 14.

*Behold Chriſt lying before you ſlain.*

In Rom. Hom. 8.

*Chriſt lies on the holy Table, as a Sacrifice ſlain for us.*

Ad Pop. Antioch. Hom. 15.

*Thou ſweareſt upon the holy Table where Chriſt lies ſlain.*

*When*

*When thou ſeeſt our Lord lying on the Table, and the Prieſt praying, and the by-ſtanders purpled with his Blood.* De Sacerd. l. 3.

*See the Love of Chriſt; he doth not only ſuffer himſelf to be ſeen by thoſe who deſire it, but to be touched and eaten, and our Teeth to be fixed in his Fleſh.* In Joh. Hom. 45.

Now theſe Expreſſions are on all ſides granted to be literally abſurd and impoſſible; and therefore we muſt ſay of him as *Bonaventure* once ſaid of S. *Auguſtin*, *Plus dicit ſanctus & minus vult intelligi*; We muſt make great allowance for ſuch Expreſſions, or you muſt hold a *Capernaitical Senſe.*

And it is denied by your ſelves, *that Chriſt is actually ſlain upon the Altar*; and therefore you yield that ſuch Expreſſions are to be figuratively underſtood.

(2.) That he lets fall many things in ſuch Diſcourſes which do give light to the reſt: As,

(1.) *That Fleſh is improperly taken when applied to the Euchariſt.* Hom. in Gal. c. 5.

(2.) He calls *the Sacrament the Myſtical Body and Blood of Chriſt.* Hom. de Reſur. To. 5.

(3.) *That the eating of Chriſt's Fleſh is not to be underſtood literally, but ſpiritually.* Hom. 46. in Joh.

(4.) He oppoſes *Chriſt's ſacramental Preſence, and real corporal Preſence to each other.* Hom. 28. in 1. Ep. ad Corinth.

(5.) He ſtill exhorts *the Communicants to look upwards towards Heaven.* Hom. 24. in 1. ad Corinth.

And now if you lay theſe things together, this Eloquent Father will not, with all his Flights, come near to *Tranſubſtantiation.* Hom. 22. in Hebr.

*P.* No! In one place he aſſerts *the Subſtance of the Elements to be loſt.* Hom. de Pœnit. To. 6.

*Pr.* Thanks to the *Latin* Tranſlators, for the *Greek* word ἀπωσιάζειν, as the *Criticks* obſerve, doth not ſignify *to deſtroy*, but *to refine*, and purify a Subſtance. But I do not rely upon this; for the plain anſwer is, That S. *Chryſoſtom* doth not there ſpeak of the *Elements* upon *Conſecration*, but what becomes of them, after they are taken down into the Stomach. St. *Chryſoſtom* thought it would leſſen the Peoples Reverence, and Devotion, if they paſſed into the draught, as *Origen* affirmed; and therefore he ſtarted another Opinion; *viz. That as Wax, when it is melted in the fire, throws off no ſuperfluities, but it paſſes indiſcernably away*; *ſo the Elements, or Myſteries, as he calls them, paſs imperceptibly into the ſubſtance of the Body, and ſo are conſumed together with it. Therefore*, ſaith he, *approach with Reverence, not ſuppoſing that you receive the divine body from a Man, but as with Tongs of Fire from the Seraphims:* Which the Author of the *Conſenſus Veterum* tranſlates, *but Fire from the Tongues of Seraphims.* S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Words are, ἀλλ' ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆ Σεραφὶμ τῇ λαβίδι τὸ πυρὸς· And the ſenſe is, *that the divine Body* (i. e. the *Euchariſt*, after *Conſecration*, being by the *divine Spirit made the divine Body, as in* St. *Chryſoſtom's Liturgy*, there is a particular Prayer for *the Holy Ghoſt to come, and ſo make the Bread to be the divine Body, or the holy Body of Chriſt*), is to be taken, *not with our Mouths*, which can only receive the Elements, but after *a divine manner, as with Tongs of fire from Seraphims*; by which he expreſſes the ſpiritual acts of Faith and Devotion, as moſt agreeable to that *divine Spirit* which makes the Elements to become the *holy Body of Chriſt.* But that St. *Chryſoſtom* did truly and firmly believe *the Subſtance* of the Bread to remain after Conſecration, I have already proved from his Epiſtle to *Cæſarius.* P. 56. Euchologe p. 77.

*P.* I pray let us not go backward, having so much ground to run over still.

*Pr.* I am content, if you will produce only those who speak of the *change of Substance*, and not such as only mention *the Body and Blood of Christ after Consecration*, which I have already told you, was the Language of the Church; and therefore all those Testimonies are of no force in this matter.

*P.* Then I must quit the greatest part of what remains, as *Optatus*, *Gaudentius*, S. *Jerom*, and others; but I have some still left which will set you hard. What say you then to *Gregory Nyssen*, who saith, *the sanctified bread is changed into the body of the word of God?* And he takes off your Answer of a *mystical Body*; for he puts the Question, *How the same Body can daily be distributed to the faithful throughout the World, it remaining whole and entire in it self?*

Greg. Nyssen. Orat. Catech. 37.

*Pr.* *Gregory Nyssen* was a Man of Fancy, and he shewed it in that *Catechetical Discourse*: However, *Fronto Ducæus* thought it *a notable place to prove Transubstantiation*, which I wonder at, if he attended to the Design of it; which was to shew, that as our Bodies, by eating became subject to Corruption, so by eating they become capable of Immortality; and this he saith, *Must be by receiving an immortal Body into our Bodies, such as the Body of Christ was:* But then, saith he, *how could that body, which is to remain whole in it self, be distributed to all the faithful over the whole Earth?* He answers, by saying, *That our Bodies do consist of Bread and Wine, which are their proper Nourishment; and Christ's Body being like ours, that was so too; which by the Union with the Word of God, was changed into a Divine Dignity.* But what is this to the *Eucharist*, you may say? He goes on therefore, *so I believe the sanctified Bread, by the power of the Word of God, to be changed into the Body of God the Word.* Not into that *Individual Body*, but after the same *manner*, by a *Presence* of the λόγος, or *God the Word* in it; and that this was his meaning, doth evidently appear by what follows. *For*, saith he, *that Body, viz.* to which he was *Incarnate, was sanctified by the Inhabitation of the* λόγος, *dwelling in the Flesh; therefore, as the Bread was then changed into a Divine Dignity in the Body, so it is now; and the Bread is changed into the Body of the* λόγος, (not of *Jesus Christ*) *as it was said by the Word, This is my Body. And so by receiving this Divine Body into our bodies, they are made capable of Immortality.* And this is the true Account of *Gregory Nyssen*'s meaning, which if it prove any thing, proves an *Impanation*, rather than *Transubstantiation*.

Nubes Testium, p. 114.

*P.* But *Hilary*'s Testimony cannot be so avoided; who saith, *That we as truly eat Christ's Flesh in the Sacrament, as he was truly Incarnate; and that we are to judge of this, not by carnal Reason, but by the Words of Christ*, who said, *My Flesh is meat indeed, and my Blood is drink indeed.*

*Pr.* I do not deny this to be *Hilary*'s sense. But yet this proves nothing like to *Transubstantiation*. For it amounts to no more than a *Real Presence* of the Body of Christ in the Sacrament; and you can make no Argument from hence, unless you can prove that the Body of Christ cannot be present, unless the *Substance* of the *Bread* be destroy'd, which is more than can be done, or than *Hilary* imagined. All that he aimed at, was to prove a *real Union* between Christ and his People, *That Christ*

*was*

*was in them more than by mere conſent*; and to prove this, he lays hold of thoſe words of our Saviour, *My Fleſh is meat indeed*, &c. But the ſubſtantial Change of the Bread into the Subſtance of Chriſt's Body, ſignifies nothing to his purpoſe; and *Bellarmin* never ſo much as mentions *Hilary* in his proofs of *Tranſubſtantiation*, but only for the *real Preſence*. But I muſt add ſomething more, *viz.* that *Hilary* was one of the *firſt* who drew any Argument from the *literal Senſe of John 6.* I do not ſay, who did by way of *Accommodation*, apply them to the *Sacrament*, which others might do before him. But yet, there are ſome of the eldeſt Fathers, who do wholly exclude a literal Senſe, as *Tertullian* look'd on it, *As an abſurdity that Chriſt ſhould be thought truly to give his Fleſh to eat. Quaſi vere carnem ſuam illis edendam determinâſſet.* And *Origen* ſaith, *It is a killing Letter, if thoſe Words be literally underſtood.* But this is to run into another debate, whereas our Buſineſs is about *Tranſubſtantiation.* If you have any more, let us now examine their Teſtimonies.

Tertul. de Reſur. carn. c. 37. Orig. hom. 7. in Levit.

*P.* What ſay you then to St. *Ambroſe*, who ſpeaks home to the Buſineſs, for he makes *the Change to be above Nature, and into the Body of Chriſt, born of the Virgin?* There are long Citations out of him, but in theſe words lies the whole ſtrength of them.

Ambroſ. de his qui initiantur, c. 9.

*Pr.* I anſwer, ſeveral things for clearing of his meaning, (1.) That St. *Ambroſe* doth parallel *the Change* in the *Euchariſt*, with that in *Baptiſm*; and to prove *Regeneration therein*, he argues from the *miraculous Conception of Chriſt in the Womb of the Virgin*; but in Baptiſm no body ſuppoſes the *Subſtance of the Water* to be taken away; and therefore it cannot hold as to the other, from the *Supernatural Change*, which may be only with reſpect to ſuch a *Divine Influence*, which it had not before Conſecration. (2.) He doth purpoſely talk obſcurely and myſtically about this matter, as the Fathers were wont to do to thoſe, who were to be admitted to theſe *Myſteries*. Sometimes one would think he meant that the Elements are changed into *Chriſt's Individual Body born of the Virgin:* and yet preſently after, he diſtinguiſhes between the *true Fleſh of Chriſt, which was crucified and buried, and the Sacrament of his Fleſh.* If this were the ſame, what need any diſtinction? And that this *Sacramentum Carnis*, is meant of the *Euchariſt*, is plain by what follows; for he cites Chriſt's words, *This is my Body.* (3.) He beſt explains his own meaning, when he ſaith not long after, *That the body of Chriſt in the Sacrament, is a Spiritual body, or a body produced by the Divine Spirit*; and ſo he parallels it with *that ſpiritual Food, which the* Iſraelites *did eat in the Wilderneſs:* And no man will ſay, that the *Subſtance* of the *Manna* was then loſt. And ſince your Authors make the ſame St. *Ambroſe*, to have written the Book *De Sacramentis*, there is a notable paſſage therein, which helps to explain this; for there he ſaith expreſly, *Non iſte Panis eſt qui vadit in Corpus, ſed ille Panis Vitæ Eternæ qui animæ noſtræ Subſtantiam fulcit. It is not the Bread which paſſes into the Body, but the Bread of Eternal Life, which ſtrengthens the Subſtance of our Soul.* Where he not only calls it *Bread* after *Conſecration*, which goes to *our Nouriſhment*; but he diſtinguiſhes it from *the Bread of Eternal Life, which ſupports the Soul*, which muſt be underſtood of *Divine Grace*, and not of any *Bodily Subſtance:*

C. 3.

De Sacram. l. 5. c. 4.

*P.* I perceive you will not leave us one Father of the whole number.

*Pr.* Not one. And I hope this gives an incomparable Advantage to the Doctrine of the *Trinity* in point of *Tradition*, above *Tranſubſtantiation:* when I have not only proved, that the greateſt of the Fathers expreſly denied it, but that there is not one in the whole number who affirmed it. For altho' there were ſome difference in the way of explaining how the Euchariſt was the Body and Blood of Chriſt; yet not one of them hitherto produced, doth give any countenance to your Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*, which the Council of *Trent* declared to have been *the conſtant belief of the Church in all Ages*; which is ſo far from being true, that there is as little ground to believe that, as *Tranſubſtantiation* it ſelf. And ſo much as to this Debate, concerning the comparing the Doctrine of the *Trinity* and *Tranſubſtantiation*, in point of *Tradition*; if you have any thing to ſay farther, as to *Scripture* and *Reaſon*, I ſhall be ready to give you Satisfaction the next Opportunity.

THE

# THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY AND Tranſubſtantiation COMPARED, &c.

## The Second PART.

Wherein the Doctrine of the **Trinity** is ſhewed to be agreeable to Scripture and Reaſon, and **Tranſubſtantiation** repugnant to both.

*Pr.* I Hope you are now at Leiſure to proceed with your parallel between the Doctrine of the Trinity and Tranſubſtantiation, as to Scripture and Reaſon.

*P.* Yes, and am reſolved to make good all that I have ſaid, as to both thoſe.

*Pr.* And if you do, I will yield the Cauſe.

*P.* I begin with *Scripture*. And the whole Diſpute as to both, depends on this: Whether the Scripture is to be underſtood Literally or Figuratively. If Literally, then Tranſubſtantiation ſtands upon equal terms with the Trinity; if Figuratively, then the Trinity can no more be proved from Scripture, than Tranſubſtantiation.

*Pr.* As tho' there might not be Reaſon for a *figurative Senſe* in one place, and a *literal* in another.

*P.* It ſeems then, you reſolve it into Reaſon.

*Pr.* And I pray, into what would you reſolve it? Into no Reaſon?

*P.* Into the Authority of the Church.

*Pr.* Without any Reaſon.

*P.* No: There may be Reaſon for that Authority, but not for the thing which I believe upon it.

*Pr.* Then you believe the Doctrine of the Trinity, merely, becauſe the Church tells you it is the literal ſenſe of Scripture which you are to follow. But ſuppoſe a Man ſees no Reaſon for this Authority of

your Church; (as for my part, I do not) have you no Reaſon to convince ſuch a one that he ought to believe the Trinity?

*P.* Not I. For I think Men are bound to believe as the Church Teaches them, and for that Reaſon.

*Pr.* What is it, I pray, to believe?

*P.* To believe, is to give our Aſſent to what God reveals.

*Pr.* And hath God revealed the Doctrine of the Trinity to the Church in this Age?

*P.* No; it was revealed long ago.

*Pr.* How doth it appear?

*P.* By the Scripture ſenſed by the Church.

*Pr.* But whence come you to know that the Church is to give the Senſe of the Scriptures? Is it from the Scripture, or not?

*P.* From the Scripture doubtleſs, or elſe we could not believe upon the Church's Teſtimony.

*Pr.* But ſuppoſe the Queſtion be, about the Senſe of theſe places which relate to the Church's Authority, how can a Man come to the certain Senſe of them?

*P.* Hold a little, I ſee whither you are leading me; you would fain draw me into a Snare, and have me ſay, I believe the ſenſe of Scripture from the Authority of the Church, and the Authority of the Church from the ſenſe of Scripture.

*Pr.* Do you not ſay ſo in plain terms?

*P.* Give me leave to anſwer for my ſelf. I ſay in the caſe of the Church's Authority, I believe the ſenſe of Scripture without relying on the Church's Authority.

*Pr.* And why not as well as in any other? Why not as to the Trinity, which to my underſtanding, is much plainer there, than the Church's Authority?

*P.* That is ſtrange: Is not the Church often ſpoken of in Scripture? *Tell the Church. Upon this Rock will I build my Church*, &c.

*Pr.* But we are not about the Word *Church*, which is no doubt there, but the Infallible Authority of the Church; and whether that be more clear in the Scripture than the Doctrine of the Trinity.

*P.* I ſee you have a mind to change your Diſcourſe, and to run off from the Trinity to the Church's Authority in Matters of Faith; which is a beaten Subject.

*Pr.* Your Church doth not tell you ſo; and therefore you may upon your own grounds be deceived; and I aſſure you that you are ſo; for I intended only to ſhew you, that for Points of Faith we muſt examine and compare Scripture our ſelves, and our Faith muſt reſt on Divine Revelation therein contained.

*P.* Then you think the Trinity can be proved from Scripture?

*Pr.* Or elſe I ſhould never believe it.

*P.* But thoſe places of Scripture you go upon, may bear a *figurative Senſe*, as John 10. 30. *I and my Father are one*; and 1 John 5. 7. *And thoſe three are one*; and if they do ſo, you can never prove the Trinity from them.

*Pr.* I ſay therefore, That the Doctrine of the Trinity doth not depend merely on theſe places, but on very many others, which help to the true ſenſe of theſe; but Tranſubſtantiation depends upon one ſingle Expreſſion, *This is my Body*, which relates to a *figurative thing*, viz. the Sacrament; and which hath other Expreſſions joined with it, which

are owned to be *figurative*; *This Cup is the New Teſtament in my Blood*; and which in the literal ſenſe cannot prove Tranſubſtantiation, as your own Writers confeſs, and which is diſproved by thoſe places of Scripture, which aſſert the Bread and the Fruit of the Vine to remain after Conſecration.

*P.* Shew the Literal Senſe as to the *Trinity* to be neceſſary; for I perceive you would fain go off again.

*Pr.* Will you promiſe to hold cloſe to the Argument your ſelf?

*P.* You need not fear me.

*Pr.* I pray tell me, Were there not falſe Religions in the World when Chriſt came into it to plant the true Religion?

*P.* Yes; but how far is this from the buſineſs?

*Pr.* Have a little Patience; Did not Chriſt deſign by his Doctrine to root out thoſe falſe Religions?

*P.* That is evident from Scripture and Church Hiſtory.

*Pr.* Then Chriſt's Religion and theirs were inconſiſtent.

*P.* And what then?

*Pr.* Wherein did this Inconſiſtency lie?

*P.* The *Gentiles* worſhipped falſe Gods inſtead of the true One.

*Pr.* Then the Chriſtian Religion teaches the worſhip of the true God inſtead of the falſe ones.

*P.* Who doubts of that?

*Pr.* Then it cannot teach the Worſhip of a falſe God inſtead of the true One.

*P.* A falſe God is one that is ſet up in oppoſition to the true God, as the Gods of the Heathens were.

*Pr.* Is it lawful by the Chriſtian Doctrine to give proper Divine Worſhip to a Creature?

*P.* I think not, for Chriſt ſaid, *Thou ſhalt Worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve:* Which our Church underſtands of proper Divine Worſhip.

*Pr.* But the Scripture requires proper Divine Worſhip to be given to Chriſt; which is to require proper Divine Worſhip to be given to a Creature, if Chriſt be not true God by Nature.

*P.* May not God communicate his own Worſhip to him?

*Pr.* But God hath ſaid, *He will not give his glory to another*, Iſa. 42. 8. And the Reaſon is conſiderable, which is there given; *I am the Lord, that is my name*; which ſhews that none but the true *Jehovah* is capable of Divine Worſhip: for adoration is due to God only on the account of his incommunicable Perfections, and therefore the Reaſon of Divine Worſhip cannot reach to any Creature.

*P.* Not without God's Will and Pleaſure. But may not God advance a mere Creature to that Dignity, as to require Divine Worſhip to be given to him by his fellow creatures?

*Pr.* Wherein lies the nature of that which you call proper Divine Worſhip?

*P.* In a due eſteem of God in our Minds, as the firſt Cauſe and laſt End of his Creatures, and ſuch Acts as are agreeable thereto.

*Pr.* Then proper Divine Worſhip doth ſuppoſe an Eſteem of God as infinitely above his Creatures; and how then is it poſſible for us to give the ſame Worſhip to God, and to a Creature? For if the diſtance be infinite between God and his Creatures, and we muſt judge of things as they are, then we muſt in our minds ſuppoſe a Creature to be infinitely

nitely distant from God; and if we do so, How is it possible to give the same Divine Worship in this sense to God, and to any Creature?

*P.* And what now would you infer from hence?

*Pr.* Do not you see already; *viz.* that God cannot be supposed to allow Divine Worship to be given to Christ, if he were a mere Creature; and therefore since such Divine Worship is required by the Christian Doctrine it follows, that those expressions which speak of his being *One with the Father*, cannot be *figuratively* understood.

*P.* But where is it, that such Divine Worship is required to be given to Christ in Scripture? For, according to my Principles, the Church is to set the bounds and measures of Divine Worship, and to declare what Worship is due to God; what to Christ; what to Saints and Angels; what to Men upon Earth; what to Images, Sacraments, *&c.* And if we depart from this Rule, I know not where we shall fix.

*Pr.* I pray tell me, doth the difference between God and his Creatures, depend on the will of the Church?

*P.* No.

*Pr.* Is it then in the Church's Power to give that to a Creature, which belongs only to God?

*P.* I think not.

*Pr.* Who then is to be judge what belongs to God, and what not? God or the Church?

*P.* God himself, if he pleases.

*Pr.* Then our business is to search what his Will and Pleasure is in this matter, by reading the Scriptures, wherein his Will is contained: And there we find it expressed, *That all Men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father*, John 5. 23. *Let all the Angels of God worship him*, Heb. 1. 6. *Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power be unto him that sitteth on the Throne, and to the Lamb for ever and ever*, Revel. 4. 13. *That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in Heaven, and things in earth*, &c. Phil. 2. 9. If it were God's great design, by the Christian Doctrine, to restore in the world a due sense of the infinite distance between God and his Creatures; could any thing be more repugnant to it, than in the same Doctrine to advance a creature to a participation of the same Divine Honour with himself? So that in plain truth, the Idolatry of the world lay only in a bad choice of the Creatures they were to worship, and not in giving proper Divine Worship to a Creature; for that Christianity it self not only allows but requires, on supposition that Christ were God merely by Office, and was originally a Creature, as we are. But I pray observe the force of the Apostle's Argument, speaking of the *Gentile* Idolatry; he saith it lay in this, *That they did service unto them, which by Nature are no Gods*, Gal. 4. 8.

*P.* You know, I must now personate the *Anti-Trinitarian*; and he answers, That *by Nature* no more is implied, than *truly and really*, i. e. God did not advance those Creatures among the *Gentiles* to that Worship and Honour, which he hath done Christ.

*Pr.* Then you make it lawful by the Gospel to believe Christ to be a mere Creature, and at the same time to give him Divine Worship, which supposes him not to be a Creature; and so you must believe him to be a Creature, and not to be a Creature, at the same time.

*P.* How do you make that appear?

*Pr.* From

*Pr.* From your own words; for you ſay, proper Divine Worſhip lies in a due eſteem of God in our minds, as the firſt Cauſe and laſt End, and in actions agreeable thereto; then to give Divine Worſhip to God, we muſt believe him to be above all Creatures as to his Nature and Being; and therefore to give Chriſt Divine Worſhip, muſt imply our believing him not to be a Creature, and to be a Creature at the ſame time.

*P.* But the meaning of Divine Worſhip here muſt not then relate to Acts of the Mind, but to outward Acts of Adoration in the Church.

*Pr.* Were the *Gentiles* guilty of Idolatry in that reſpect, or not?

*P.* Yes; but not thoſe, whom God requires to Worſhip in ſuch a manner.

*Pr.* Then the Sin of *Gentile*-Idolatry lay only in giving Divine Worſhip to a Creature without God's command; which leſſens it to that degree, as to make Will-worſhip and Idolatry the ſame; and to blame the Apoſtles, for making ſuch a dreadful Sin of it, and diſſuading Chriſtians ſo much from returning to the Practice of it: For they had the privilege of giving Divine Worſhip to a Creature by God's command, which others were damned for doing without a command; which makes the Chriſtian Religion not to appear ſo reaſonable, as the *Anti-Trinitarians* contend it is. But here are four foul miſtakes in point of *Reaſon*, which they are guilty of. (1.) In making the Sin of Idolatry ſo Arbitrary a thing; which depends not on the Nature of the Object which is worſhipped, but on the Will and Pleaſure of God. (2.) In making the *Gentiles* guilty of a great Sin, merely in wanting a Divine command, which was out of their Power. (3.) In making the Chriſtian Religion to ſet up the Worſhip of a Creature, when its deſign was to root out Idolatry. (4.) In making a factitious God, or a Creature to be advanced to the Throne of God. Which I think is far more contradictious to Reaſon, than a Trinity of Perſons in the Unity of the ſame Nature. For nothing can be more abſurd than to make that to be God, which wants all the eſſential Attributes and Perfections of God; as every Creature muſt do: Such as Self-Exiſtence, Eternity, Independency, Immenſity, Omnipotency, *&c.* What a Contradiction is it, to ſuppoſe a weak, impotent, depending, confined, created God? And ſuch every Creature muſt be in its Nature, or elſe it is no Creature. I do not at all wonder to find the *Socinians* after this, to leſſen the natural Knowledge of God, and his infinite Perfections, both as to Power and Knowledge; for it was their concernment to bring the Notion of God as low as poſſible, that a Creature might be in the nearer Capacity of being made God. But thoſe who conſider and know what God is, and what he muſt be, if he be God, will find far greater difficulty in making Man to be God, than in believing God to be made Man. For This implies no greater difficulty, than merely as to our Conception, how an infinite Being can be ſo united to a finite, as to become one Perſon; which implies no repugnancy, but only ſome thing above our Capacity to comprehend. And we confeſs our ſelves puzled in the manner of conceiving how a finite Spirit, which can paſs through a Body, can be ſo united to it, as to make a Man by that Union; yet we all acknowledge the Truth of this. But to ſuppoſe a Creature capable of being made God, is to overthrow the eſſential difference between God and his Creatures, and the infinite Diſtance between them. Which is

Rom. 1. 21, 23, 24. 1 Cor. 10. 7, 14. 1 Joh. 5. 21.

of

of very pernicious Conſequence, as to the great ends of the Chriſtian Religion, which were to reform the World, and to reſtore the Diſtinction between God and his Creatures; which by the prevalency of Idolatry was almoſt loſt in the World: The Supreme God being hardly diſcerned in ſuch a croud of created and factitious gods. And this very Argument is enough to turn my Stomack againſt *Socinianiſm* or *Arianiſm*.

*P.* I had thought all Men of ſenſe among you, had been *Socinians*; I have often heard them charged with being ſo.

*Pr.* You ſee how groſly you are deceived, notwithſtanding your pretence to Infallibility. I do not pretend to any deep reach, but I ſee reaſon enough to be no *Socinian*.

*P.* Let us return to our Matter in hand. What ſay you to thoſe Texts which are ſaid to be inconſiſtent with the literal Senſe of thoſe before mention'd, which relate to the Unity between Father and Son?

*Pr.* What Text do you mean?

*P.* What ſay you to *Joh.* 10. from the 30. *to the* 39?

*Pr.* I wonder what it is produced for.

*P.* 1. *It is ſaid Joh.* 10. 30. I and my Father are one; *now it is highly unreaſonable to interpret theſe words literally, becauſe of thoſe which follow.*

*Pr.* How doth that appear? For *v.* 31. it is ſaid, *That the* Jews *took up ſtones to ſtone him:* Which ſhews, that they look'd on him as ſpeaking Blaſphemy. But what Blaſphemy was it for Chriſt to declare an Unity of Conſent between him and his Father; which in Truth is nothing, but doing his Father's Will? Therefore it is plain that the *Jews* did apprehend more in thoſe Words of our Saviour. And they explain themſelves, *v.* 33. what they underſtood by them, *Becauſe that thou being a Man makeſt thy ſelf God.* Which ſhews that they thought not an *Unity* of *Conſent*, but of *Nature*, was meant.

*P.* But Chriſt's anſwer ſhews, that he ſpeaks only of a *God by Office*, and not by *Nature*, v. 34. *Jeſus anſwered them, Is it not written in your Law, I ſaid ye are Gods?*

*Pr.* I pray go on, and ſee how Chriſt argues, v. 35, 36. *If he called them Gods, unto whom the Word of God came, and the Scripture cannot be broken; ſay ye of him, whom the Father hath ſent into the World, Thou blaſphemeſt, becauſe I ſaid I am the Son of God?*

*P.* This only ſhews that Chriſt had greater Reaſon to be called *God*, but not that he was ſo by Nature.

*Pr.* I pray go on ſtill, v. 37, 38. *If I do not the Works of my Father, believe me not. But if I do, tho' ye believe not me, believe the Works, that ye may know and believe that the Father is in me, and I in him.*

*P.* Is it not ſaid elſewhere, *That he that keepeth his Commandments dwelleth in him, and he in him?* 1 Joh. 3. 24. Would you hence infer an Unity of Nature between Chriſt and Believers?

*Pr.* I do not lay the weight on the Phraſe, but as it is the Concluſion of the Diſpute between Chriſt and the *Jews*. And it ought to be obſerved, that this was the end of the third Conference between Chriſt and the *Jews* upon this Argument. The firſt was *John* 5. and then from Chriſt's ſaying, *The Father worketh hitherto and I work*, v. 17. the *Jews* infer'd, v. 18. *That he made himſelf equal with God.* In the ſecond Conference, *John* 8. he ſaid, *Before Abraham was, I am*, v. 58. *And then the Jews took up ſtones to caſt at him.* After this followed this third Conference, *John* 10. and this runs again into the ſame point,

*That he being a Man, made himself God.* And these Conferences were all publick, in or near the Temple, and this last was in *Solomon's Porch*, *John* 10. 23. a Place of great resort, and near the place where the *Sanhedrim* sate, who were the Judges in the Case of Blasphemy. Now the force of my Argument from hence, lies in these things:

(1.) That Christ certainly knew, that the *Jews* did think by his Discourse, *That he made himself equal with God.*

(2.) That if it were not true, it were notorious Blasphemy, and so esteemed by the *Jews.*

(3.) That such a mistake ought to have been presently corrected, and in the plainest manner; as we find it was done by St. *Paul*, when the Men of *Lystra* said, *The Gods are come down to us in the likeness of Men*; for he ran in presently among them, and said, *We are Men of like passions with you*, Acts 14. 11, 15. It is impossible for me to think, that if Christ had known himself to be a mere Man, he would have suffered the *Jews* to have run away with such a mistake as this, without giving them the clearest and plainest information; whereas in all his Answers he vindicates himself, and endeavours rather to fasten those Impressions upon them, as appears by this conclusion of the last Conference, *That ye may know and believe, that the Father is in me, and I in him.* Doth this look like correcting a dangerous mistake in the *Jews?* And is it not rather a justification of that sense, which they took his words in? And in the first Conference, *John* 5. Our Saviour is so far from doing as St. *Paul* did, that he challenges Divine Honour as due to himself, *That all Men should honour the Son as they honour the Father*, v. 23. From whence it follows, that Christ must be charged as one, who being a mere Man, did affect Divine Honour; or else, that being *God* as well as Man, he looked on it as justly due to him. I pray tell me what sense do your Friends the *Socinians* make of those words of St. *Paul*, Phil. 2. 6, 7. *Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made himself of no Reputation.* &c.

*P.* The sense they give, is this, that he did not make a shew or Ostentation of his own Greatness, but studiously concealed it, and therein shewed his great Humility.

*Pr.* But is there any Greatness like that of *Divine Honour?* and yet this he challenged to himself.

*P.* But he knew what the Father designed him for, and so spake those things by way of Prediction.

*Pr.* He knew no Creature could deserve Divine Worship, and he deliver'd that as part of his own Doctrine, and therefore those Words, where he is said, *to make himself equal with God*, must be understood of *Nature*, and not of *Office.*

*P.* But St. *John* 17. 22, saith, that Christ prayed to his Father, for his Disciples, *That they may be one, as we are one*; and that is not by Unity of Nature.

*Pr.* I grant it. But our Saviour there speaks of a true, but a lower kind of Unity; or else the *Socinians* must think every Believer as capable of Divine Honour, as Christ himself, if they take those Words strictly, *That they may be one as we are one.*

*P.* St. *Paul* saith, *He that planteth and he that watereth is one*, 1 Cor. 3. 8.

*Pr.* Who doubts but there are other ſorts of Unities, beſides that of Nature? But, doth this prove that there is no Unity of Nature between the Father and the Son? If we have no better Arguments againſt Tranſubſtantiation, we will give over diſputing.

*P.* I know you have other Arguments for the Trinity, but they prove as little without the Authority of the Church; as *from thoſe places where Chriſt is called God*, as *John* 1. 1, 2. *Rom.* 9. 5, *&c.*

*Pr.* And I think the Argument from thoſe places, very good and ſtrong, eſpecially from *John* 1. 1. 2, 3. and it ſeems directly contrary to the whole deſign of Scripture to call any one *God over all, Bleſſed for evermore*, as Chriſt is called, *Rom.* 9. 5. but he that is God by *Nature.*

*P.* How do you prove that *John* 1. 1. relates to any thing beyond *the beginning of the Goſpel, and that Chriſt the Word, was before* John *the Baptiſt's Preaching?*

*Pr.* I deſire any one to read the Text impartially, and he will find the *Socinian* ſenſe to be unnatural, forced, obſcure and jejune, proving a thing of no moment at that time; but the Senſe we give, to be ſtrong, weighty, conſiſtent, and of very great Conſequence at that time, when the *Cerinthians* denied the Divinity of Chriſt. The Sentences are ſhort, the Words lofty and ſignificant, the manner of beginning unuſual; ſo that any one would expect ſome great and extraordinary matter to be ſaid in theſe few Verſes; but what a fruſtration were this, if after all, they intended no more, than that altho' *John Baptiſt* preached in publick before *Chriſt*, yet that Chriſt was in being before that? Which is a Senſe ſo mean, ſo remote from the occaſion of his Writing, as it is deliver'd by the Ancients, that nothing but a miſerable neceſſity could make Men of Wit and Subtilty to put ſuch a Senſe upon St. *John*'s Words.

*P.* But they deny there was any ſuch occaſion of St. *John*'s writing, as the *Cerinthians Hereſy* at that time.

*Pr.* I know *Socinus* doth ſo; but he might as well have denied that there was any ſuch Perſon as *Cerinthus*. And I think the *Cerinthian Hereſy* not only to have been the occaſion of St. *John*'s Writing, but that the underſtanding of it, gives the greateſt and trueſt light to the Words of the Evangeliſt, ſhewing the force and importance of them.

*P.* Wherein I pray, did that Hereſy conſiſt?

*Pr.* I ſhall not meddle with other parts of it, but only what relates to the preſent Subject; and that lay in theſe things.

(1.) That there was a Supreme and unknown Father, who was *before the Beginning*, and therefore they called him προαρχὴν, who was the Fountain of all Emanations. *Iren. l.* 1. *c.* 1. 19.

(2.) That the World was not made by him, but by a Power at a diſtance from him, called *Demiurgus*, *Iren. l.* 1. *c.* 25. And in the *Egyptian* School where *Cerinthus* was educated, the Λόγος *Word*, was one of the intermediate Emanations between *the Father*, and *the Demiurgus*, *Iren. l.* 1. *c.* 23.

(3.) That this World was in a ſtate of Darkneſs and Confuſion, as to the ſupreme Father of all; only ſome few had ſome beams of Light from him, by which they knew him.

(4.) That *Jeſus* was a mere Man, born as other Men are, of *Joſeph* and *Mary*, but of extraordinary Goodneſs, Wiſdom, and Sanctity.

(5.) That

(5.) That the Supreme Father at his Baptiſm did ſend down a Divine Power upon him, in the ſhape of a Dove, which enabled him to declare the unknown Father, and to work Miracles, which returned to its own πλήρωμα, or *Fulneſs* above, when *Jeſus* ſuffer'd.

This is a ſhort Scheme of that Hereſy, as delivered by the ancient Fathers. And now let any one compare St. *John*'s Words with it; and he will find his deſign was to countermine this Hereſy by two things.

(1.) That the Λόγος *Word*, was Eternal. For the *Cerinthians* ſaid, the Λόγος was not *in the beginning*, but made a great ſpace of time between the eternal Being of the Father, and the Emanation of the Λόγος, wherein he was *in perfect Silence*, as *Irenæus* expreſſes it (*l.* 1. *c.* 1.) And ſo *in the beginning*; doth imply the Eternity of the *Word*. But that is not all, for he ſaith, *it was with God, and was God*, and was the *Demiurgus*, or the Maker of the World, and the Revealer of God to Mankind, *John* 1. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10. And ſo there was no place for thoſe ſeveral Emanations between God and the Λόγος and *Demiurgus*, as the *Cerinthians* ſaid.

(2.) That the Λόγος or *Word*, was *Incarnate*, which he affirms, v. 14. *And the Word was made Fleſh, and dwelt among us, &c.* and was *the only begotten Son of the Father*; and ſo he not only cuts off the other Emanations, but declares that *Jeſus* was far from being a mere Man. And to this purpoſe he brings in the Teſtimony of *John Baptiſt*, *v.* 15. and applies what he had ſaid to the Perſon of *Jeſus Chriſt*, *v.* 17. Now this being St. *John*'s deſign, his Words afford a Demonſtration to us of the Union of the Divine and Human Nature in Chriſt, when he ſaith, *The Word was made Fleſh.*

*P.* But doth not the Scripture in other places imply that there is a ſubordination in Chriſt to his Father, which is not conſiſtent with ſuch an Equality of Nature; ſee *Heb.* 1. 8, 9. 1 *Cor.* 8. 4, 5. —15. 27, 28. *Rev.* 3. 12.

*Pr.* The firſt place is a proof for the Divinity of Chriſt; for the Words are; *But unto the Son*, he ſaith, *Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever, &c.* It is true, in the next verſe, it is ſaid with reſpect to his Office, *Therefore God, even thy God hath anointed thee*, &c. But we do not deny that Chriſt was anointed as Mediator, and in that reſpect, God was his God; but doth this prove that he that is Mediator, cannot have a Divine Nature in Conjunction with the Human?

The ſecond Place, I ſuppoſe, is miſtaken, 1 *Cor.* 8. not 4 and 5, but 6 verſe, *But unto us, there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jeſus Chriſt, by whom are all things, and we by him.* And this is one of the ſtrongeſt holds of the *Socinians.* But two Conſiderations will take off the ſeeming force of it.

1. That the Apoſtle in his Diſputes with the *Gentile* Idolaters, concerning whom he ſpeaks, *v.* 4, 5. doth utterly deny any Divinity in the Beings they worſhipped inſtead of God, when he ſaith, *An Idol is nothing in the world, and that there is none other God but one.* He knew very well that they worſhipped many, *v.* 5. *As there be Gods many, and Lords many among them; but unto us* (Chriſtians) *there is but one God, and one Lord:* i. e. we have but one Supreme God, to whom we give Divine Worſhip; and inſtead of the multitude of *Mediators*, we have but *one Mediator*; and ſo his deſign is in oppoſition to their *many Gods*, to aſſert the *Unity* of the *Divine Nature*, (not ſo as to exclude a diſtinction of Perſons, but thereby to exclude other Gods as the proper Ob-

ject of Worſhip) and the *Unity* of a *Mediator*, in oppoſition to their *many Lords*.

(2.) That if this place excludes Chriſt from the Unity of Nature with God, it doth exclude him from being the Object of Divine Worſhip; for it ſaith, *That there is no other God, but One*; therefore no Creature can be made God: *And to us there is but One God, the Father*; therefore the Son cannot be God. If therefore the name *Lord* be taken in oppoſition to *God*, then Chriſt cannot be *God* in any ſenſe; for we muſt have but *One God:* but the plain meaning of the Apoſtle was, That by *one Lord* he meant *one Mediator*, by whom alone we have, in this new frame of things by the Goſpel, acceſs unto God the Father.

The third place, 1 *Cor.* 15. 27, 28. ſpeaks plainly of Chriſt's Kingdom, as Mediator.

The fourth place, *Rev.* 3. 12. where Chriſt ſpeaks ſeveral times of *my God*, proves no more than his words on the Croſs, *My God, my God, why haſt thou forſaken me:* For ſurely Chriſt might own a particular Relation to God, and Intereſt in him, as he was in human Nature, without overthrowing the Divine Nature in him.

*P.* But he owns, *That though he is to be our Judge, he knows not the time*, Mark 13. 32. Which ſeems inconſiſtent with the Divine Nature, which knoweth all things.

*Pr.* The Son there ſpoken of, was Chriſt, as endued with a human Soul, when he was upon earth; which could not underſtand a ſecret ſo much out of the reach of man's underſtanding, without immediate Revelation. But it was not neceſſary by virtue of the Union of both Natures, that the Divine Nature ſhould communicate to the human Soul of Chriſt all Divine Myſteries: but as the human Body was notwithſtanding ſubject to Paſſions and Infirmities incident to it, ſo the human Soul might continue ignorant of the Day of Judgment in this ſtate; both to let us know how great that ſecret is, and that Chriſt had the proper capacity of a human Soul, which could not extend to ſuch things without Divine Revelation.

*P.* There is one Argument more, which ſeems to prove Chriſt's Divinity, and doth not; *viz. The making of all things viſible and inviſible, being attributed to him*, John 1. 3. Heb. 1. 10. Col. 1. 16, 17, 18, 19.

*Pr.* Now I confeſs this doth more than ſeem to me to be a very ſtrong Argument; and that for this Reaſon, the Apoſtle ſaith, *The inviſible things of him from the creation of the world, are clearly ſeen, being underſtood by the things which are made, even his Eternal Power and Godhead*, Rom. 1. 20. Was this Argument of the Apoſtle good or not?

*P.* No doubt it was.

*Pr.* Then the Creation of the World is an Invincible Proof of the true God.

*P.* What follows?

*Pr.* Then if *the making of all things* be attributed to Chriſt, he muſt be true God; but this is plain in the New Teſtament, in which the making of all things is as clearly attributed to the Son, as it is to the Father; *All things* ſaith St. *John, were by him, and without him was not any thing made, that was made*, John 1. 3. *For by him were all things created*, ſaith St. *Paul, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, viſible and inviſible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers, all things were created by him, and for him*, Col. 1. 16. *Thou, Lord,*

*Lord, in the beginning hast laid the Foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thy hands*, Heb. 1. 10. Now compare these expressions with those wherein the Creation is attributed to the Father, *The world* is said *to be made by him*, Rom. 1. 20. *That he hath created all things*, Rev. 4. 11. *That of him, and for him, and to him, are all things*, Rom. 11. 36. And let any impartial mind discern the difference. Therefore we have as much Reason from Scripture to believe Christ to be God, as we have from the Creation of things to believe a God.

*P.* But you do not take notice of the different expressions in Scripture, concerning the Father and the Son; *All things are said to be of the Father, and by the Son*, 1 Cor. 8. 6. *And that the Father created all things by Jesus Christ*, Eph. 3. 9. which proves no more, than that the Son was God's Instrument in the Creation.

*Pr.* What do you mean by *God's Instrument in the Creation?* Do you think one Creature can create another? How then can the Creation prove an Infinite Power? If you believe the Instrument uncreated, then you must assert him to be *true God by Nature*; and then we have all we desire.

*P.* But the *Socinians* do not like this Answer of the *Arians*, and therefore they interpret these places, of the state of things *under the Gospel*, and not of the *Creation* of the *World*.

*Pr.* They have not one jot mended the matter; for,

(1.) Where the new Creation is spoken of, some circumstances are added, which limit the sense to it, as when St. *Paul* saith, *We are created in Christ Jesus unto good works that we should walk in them*, Eph. 2. 10. Who could possibly understand this of the old Creation? And so, *If any man be in Christ Jesus, he is a new Creature*, 2 Cor. 5. 17. But in the other places the same Expressions are used, which are attributed to the old Creation, without limitation from circumstances, or from the Context and occasion of them.

(2.) There are some things said to be created by *Christ Jesus*, which cannot relate to the new Creation; for *by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities or Powers*, Col. 1. 16. How are these created by Preaching the Gospel, when they are uncapable of the proper means of it, which are the Doctrine of the remission of Sins upon Repentance, and the Renewing and Sanctifying Grace of God?

*P.* But St. *Paul* doth not mention *the Heaven and Earth*, but only intellectual Beings, Angels, and Men, and therefore he speaks of the new Creation.

*Pr.* A mighty Argument indeed! Do not *all things* comprehend the Heaven and Earth? And the particular enumeration of Angels by several denominations, shews that he speaks of another Creation distinct from that by the Gospel preached to the World; for the Apostles were Christ's Instruments in this new Creation, which they could not be to the Invisible Powers above.

*P.* We have now gone through *the true and only Grounds of the Doctrine of the Trinity.*

*Pr.* You are extreamly mistaken. For we have other grounds besides these, although these may be sufficient.

*P.* Name one more.

*Pr.* I will name several, which you cannot disallow.

*P.* What are they?

*Pr.* The

*Pr.* The several Heads of Arguments made use of by Cardinal *Bellarmin*, to prove the Divinity of Christ: Who alone is a convincing Evidence of the vast disparity between the Proofs of this Doctrine, and of *Transubstantiation* from *Scripture*. For,

Bell. de Christo. l. 1. c. 4, &c.

1. He proves Christ's Divinity from those places of the Old Testament, which are expounded in the New; being in the Old Testament, spoken of the true God; and in the New applied to Christ. As *Numb.* 21. 5, 6. compared with 1 *Cor.* 10. 9. *Exod.* 20. 2. with *Jude* 5. *Psal.* 68. 18. with *Eph.* 4. 8, 9. *Psal.* 97. 7. and 102. 25, 26. with *Heb.* 1. 6, 10, 11. *Isa.* 6. 1, 3. with *John* 12. 41. and *Revel.* 4. 8. *Isa.* 8. 14. with *Luke* 2. 34. and *Rom.* 9. 33. *Isa.* 40. 3. with *Mat.* 3. 3. *Mark* 1. 3. *Luke* 1. 76. *John* 1. 23.— *Isa.* 45. 23. with *Rom.* 14. 11.— *Isa.* 44. 6. with *Revel.* 1. 8, 17. *Mal.* 3. 1. with *Mat.* 11. 10.

2. From the Places of the Old Testament, which attribute to Christ those things which belong to God; as *Power and Adoration*, Psal. 2. 7, 8, 12. *Being the first and last*, Isa. 48. 1. 12, 16. *Working Miracles*, Isa. 35. 5. *Being the God of Israel*, Isa. 52. 5, 6. *The only God*, Isa. 45. 5, 6. *The Lord of Hosts*, Zach. 2. 8, 9, 10, 11. *Jehovah*, Zach. 3. 2. *Pouring out of the Spirit*, Zach. 12. 10.

3. From the Places of the New Testament, which attribute Divinity to Christ. As when he is called, *the Son of the Living God*, Mat. 16. 16. *The only begotten Son of God*, John 3. 16. *His own Son*, Rom. 8. 32. *His true Son*, 1 John 5. 20. *His dear Son*, Col. 1. 13. *His Son above all others*, Heb. 1. 5. *The express Image of his Person*, Heb. 1. 3. *Making himself equal with God*, John 5. 18. *Being one with the Father*, John 10. 30. *Lord and God*, John 20. 28. *God blessed for ever*, Rom. 9. 5. *Who thought it no robbery to be equal with God*, Phil. 2. 6. *One with the Father and Spirit*, 1 John 5. 7. *The true God*, 1 John 5. 20.

4. From the proper Names of God, *Isa.* 9. 6. *John* 20. 28. *Acts* 20. 28. *Rom.* 9. 5. *Revel.* 4. 8. 1 *John* 3. 16. The name *Jehovah*, *Jer.* 23. 5. 8. *Isa.* 40. 3. *The Lord*, by which the LXX render Jehovah, *Mat.* 21. 3. *John* 13. 13. *The most High*, Psal. 87. 5. *A Name above every Name*, Phil. 2. 9. *The Invisible One*, 1 Tim. 1. 17, and 6. 16. *The God of Glory*, Acts 7. 2. 1 Cor. 2. 8. Psal. 24. 7, 8, 9. *King of Kings and Lord of Lords*, 1 Tim. 6. 15. Revel. 17. 14. and 19. 16. *The one Lord*, 1 Cor. 8. 6. *The true God*, John 5. 20. *The only Lord*, Jude 4. *The great God and our Saviour*, Titus 2. 13.

5. From the proper Attributes of God; as *Eternity*, Prov. 8. 22, 23. Mic. 5. 2. John 1. 1, —— 17. 5. *Immensity*, John 3. 13. Mat. 18. 20. *Omnipotency*, Rev. 1. 8. — 4. 8. — 11, 17. *Wisdom*, Colos. 2. 3. John 21. 17. *Majesty and Adoration*, Heb. 1. 6. Mal. 3. 1. *Invocation*, John 14. 13. Acts 7. 59. and 9. 14. 2 Cor. 12. 8. 1 Cor. 1. 3. 2 John 3.

6. From the proper Works of God: as not only *Creation*, (of which already) but *Conservation*, Heb. 1. 3. Colos. 1. 17. *Salvation*, Matth. 1. 21. *Foretelling future Events*, John 13. 19. 1 Pet. 1. 11. Rev. 2. 23. *Working Miracles by his own Power*, Mark 4. 39. and *giving Power to others to work them*, Mat. 10. 1.

What think you now of the Proofs of the Trinity in Scripture? Do you think *Bellarmin* could produce any thing like this for Transubstantiation? No; so far from it, that where he sets himself in a whole Chapter to prove it from Scripture, he produces a *First* without a *Second*. *The first Argument*, saith he, *is taken from Christ's Words, This is my Body.* Very well! but where is the *Second?* For no more could be produced,

Bell. de Euch. l. 3. c. 19.

but

but this one ſingle Paſſage, about which he ſpends his whole Chapter, and then betakes himſelf preſently to the *Fathers.*

*P.* But one plain and clear place is ſufficient, if we be certain of the ſenſe of that one; for we are as much bound to believe God when we are ſure he ſpeaks it once, as an hundred times.

*Pr.* We have been all this while comparing theſe two Doctrines as to *Scripture*, and now you ſee the diſproportion ſo very great, as to *number* and *variety*, you ſay, *one is as good as an hundred*; but that one had need to be wonderfully clear, which this is very far from, ſince many of your own Writers do confeſs Tranſubſtantiation cannot be drawn from it; as *Bellarmin* himſelf owns, and he affirms it *not to be improbable,* C. 13. *that no place of Scripture is ſo clear and expreſs for Tranſubſtantiation, but learned and acute Men may doubt whether it can be drawn from it, ſetting aſide the Church's Declaration.* But neither *Bellarmin*, nor any one who attends to the force of the former Proofs of the Divinity of Chriſt, can ſay, that any *reaſonable Man* can doubt of it; and that he muſt at laſt reſolve all into the Church's Authority.

*P.* Have not learned and acute Men doubted as well of the Divinity of Chriſt, as of Tranſubſtantiation? And therefore in that reſpect they are both alike.

*Pr.* We do not inſiſt upon Men's bare doubting, but on the *Reaſon* of their doubting. And when but one ſingle Place is produced, which is yielded not to be ſufficient of it ſelf to prove the Doctrine; there is much more cauſe of doubting, than where ſuch multitudes of Places are produced; and no doubt is made by thoſe who favour *Tranſubſtantiation*, but that they do fully prove the Divinity of Chriſt.

*P.* It ſeems then we muſt come to *Reaſon* at laſt. And for my part, I muſt tell you, *I think that Parallel much the eaſieſt. For, that three diſtinct Perſons ſhould be in one individual Nature, and that the moſt pure and ſimple Being, ſeems to me to be more abſurd than Tranſubſtantiation.*

*Pr.* Let us ſet aſide the *comparing* Abſurdities at preſent, and only examin in point of *Reaſon*, the great Abſurdity of *three Perſons being in one Individual Divine Nature.*

*P.* I did hardly believe you would have the courage to defend the Doctrine of the Trinity in point of Reaſon; but I ſee you are a bold Man, and will venture farther than wiſer Men.

*Pr.* It may be others have not had the leiſure or curioſity to examine a Myſtery believed to be ſo much out of the reach of our Underſtanding; or have confounded themſelves and others ſo much with *School-terms*, as to leave the matter rather more obſcure than it was before. But I ſhall endeavour to make things as clear as they will bear. And that which I inſiſt upon is, that the Abſurdities are not to appearance ſo great as thoſe of Tranſubſtantiation. And therefore I deſire you to produce thoſe which appear the moſt dreadful.

*P.* I ſhall reduce all to theſe two, which comprehend the reſt.

1. *How there can be three Perſons and but one God.*

2. *How theſe can agree in a third, and not agree among themſelves.*

For the firſt, it ſeems very abſurd, that there ſhould be three Perſons really diſtinct, whereof every one is God, and yet there ſhould not be three Gods; for nothing is more contradictious than to make three not to be three, or three to be but one.

*Pr.* I hope now you will give me leave to make an Anſwer to your Difficulty as diſtinct as poſſible. We do not ſay that three Perſons are

but one Perſon, or that one Nature is three Natures; but that there are three Perſons in one Nature. If therefore one individual Nature be communicable to three Perſons, there is no appearance of abſurdity in this Doctrine. And on the other ſide, it will be impoſſible there ſhould be three Gods, where there is one and the ſame individual Nature; for three Gods muſt have three ſeveral Divine Natures, ſince it is the Divine Eſſence which makes a God. But to make this more plain, Do you make any difference between *Nature* and *Perſon?*

*P.* Yes,

*Pr.* Wherein lies it?

*P.* Excuſe me, Sir, for you have undertaken to explain theſe things.

*Pr.* I will begin with *Perſon.* Which Name was originally taken among the *Romans* from ſome remarkable diſtinction of one from another, either by ſome outward appearance, as a Vizard or Habit, or ſome particular Quality or Diſpoſition. And from hence it came to be applied to thoſe inward Properties, whereby one intelligent Being is diſtinguiſhed from another; and from thoſe Properties, to the Perſon who had them. Thus *Perſon* is uſed even by *Tully* himſelf, at leaſt twenty times in his Books of Rhetorick: and the old Civil Law ſpeaks of *Perſonal Rights*, and *Perſonal Actions.* So that the Criticks, ſuch as *Valla*, and others, had no cauſe to find fault with *Boëthius*, for applying the Notion of a *Perſon*, to an *intelligent Being ſubſiſting by it ſelf*, (and ſo the Soul is no Perſon in Men, but the Man conſiſting of Soul and Body) *having ſome incommunicable Properties belonging to him:* Therefore I cannot but wonder at the niceneſs of ſome late Men, who would have the Names of *Perſon*, and *Hypoſtaſis*, and *Trinity*, to be laid aſide, ſince themſelves confeſs *Boëthius* his definition of a Perſon to be true enough; but they ſay, *it belongs to the Creatures, and not to God, for it would make three Gods.* Which is to ſuppoſe, without proving it, that the Divine Nature can communicate it ſelf after no other manner than a created Nature can.

This is now to be more ſtrictly enquired into. And it is very well obſerved by *Boëthius*, *de Trin. l.* 1. *Principium pluralitatis alteritas eſt: That Diverſity is the reaſon of Plurality:* And therefore in the Trinity, ſo far as they are different, they are Three, *i. e.* in regard of *Perſonal Properties and Relations*; but ſo far as they agree, they are but ONE, that is, as to the Divine Nature.

It is very true, that according to Arithmetick, *Three cannot be One, nor One Three*; but we muſt diſtinguiſh between the bare Numeration, and the Things numbred. The repetition of *three Unites*, certainly make three diſtinct Numbers; but it doth not make *three Perſons* to be *three Natures.* And therefore as to the Things themſelves, we muſt go from the bare *Numbers*, to conſider their *Nature.* Where-ever there is a real diſtinction, we may multiply the Number, tho' the Subject be but One. As, ſuppoſe we ſay the Soul hath three Faculties, Underſtanding, Will and Memory; we may, without the leaſt abſurdity ſay, *there are Three and One*; and thoſe Three not confounded with each other, and yet there is but One Soul.

*P.* But the *Socinians* object, that there is a difference between *three Properties*, and *three diſtinct Perſons*; becauſe a *Perſon is an individual Being*; and ſo three Perſons muſt be three individual Beings; and therefore as there is but one Divine Being, there can be but one Perſon.

*Pr.* This

*Pr.* This is the main ſtrength of the Cauſe; to which I anſwer, That altho' a *Perſon* be an individual Being, yet it implies two Things in it: (1.) Something common with others of the ſame Nature; as three Men have one and the ſame Nature, tho' they be three Perſons. (2.) Something peculiar and incommunicate to any other; ſo that *John* cannot be *Peter*, nor *Peter*, *James*.

*P.* But what is it which makes one not to be the other, when they have the ſame common Nature?

*Pr.* You aſk a hard Queſtion, *viz.* about the *Principle* of *Individuation*; but if it be ſo hard to reſolve it, as to created Beings, there is certainly far leſs reaſon for us to be unſatisfied, if it appear difficult to clear the difference of *Nature* and *Perſon* in an infinite Being. Yet all Mankind are agreed in the Thing, *viz.* That there is a Community of the ſame Nature, and a real diſtinction of Perſons among men, though they cannot tell what that is which diſcriminates the Humane Nature in *John*, from the ſame Humane Nature in *Peter* and *James*. And it is obſervable, that as Beings ariſe in perfection above each other, it is ſtill ſo much harder to aſſign that which is called the *Principle* of *Individuation*. In groſs and material Beings we can diſcern a number of Accidents, or peculiar Modes and Properties, which diſtinguiſh them from each other; but it is much harder to aſſign it in ſpiritual and intellectual Beings, whoſe Natures and Differences lie not ſo open to our Underſtandings. If ſo be then it appears more difficult in an infinite and incomprehenſible Being, what cauſe have we to wonder at it.

But we muſt always make a difference between what we have reaſon to believe, and what we have a power to conceive. Altho' we have all the reaſon in the world to believe that there is a God, *i. e.* a Being infinite in all Perfections; yet we muſt yield that his eſſential Attributes are above our comprehenſion. As for Inſtance:

(1.) We muſt believe God to be Eternal, or we cannot believe him to be God; for if he once were not, it is impoſſible he ſhould ever be; and therefore we conclude neceſſary Exiſtence to be an eſſential Attribute of the Divine Nature: But then, how to conceive that a Being ſhould be from it ſelf, is at leaſt as hard, as how one and the ſame individual Nature ſhould be communicated to three diſtinct Perſons; nay, it is ſomewhat harder, ſince we ſee ſomething like this in other Beings; but we can ſee no manner of reſemblance of a thing that hath its Being wholly from it ſelf.

(2.) We muſt allow God to be *Omnipreſent*, or elſe we muſt ſuppoſe him ſo confined and limited to a certain place, as to be excluded from any other; and if he can act in all places, he muſt either be preſent in them, or his Power muſt be larger than his Being, which is infinite; but after this, we have not a power to conceive how a Being ſhould be preſent in the whole World, and not to be extended; and if it be extended, how it ſhould be uncapable of being divided into parts, which is certainly repugnant to the Divine Nature. I therefore produce theſe two Inſtances, to let the *Antitrinitarians* ſee, that what they object in Point of Reaſon, as to the Incomprehenſibility of the Myſtery of the Trinity, will in conſequence overthrow the Divine Nature. But as there is the higheſt Reaſon to believe there is a God, though we cannot comprehend his Perfections, ſo there may be great Reaſon to believe the Doctrine of the Trinity, tho' we cannot comprehend the manner of it.

*P.* I had thought you intended to explain the Myſtery of it, and now you tell us it is *Incomprehenſible*.

*Pr.* It is a good ſtep to our believing it, to make it plain, that the difficulty of our conception ought not to hinder our Faith. And I have made ſome advance towards the explication of it, by ſhewing, that ſince Mankind are agreed about the difference between *Nature* and *Perſon*, the whole difficulty comes to this, that the ſame common Nature in Mankind makes three Perſons; but that it is the ſame individual Nature in all the Perſons of the Trinity.

And now let us conſider the infinite Perfection and Simplicity of the Divine Nature; and we ſhall think it unreaſonable that it ſhould be ſo bounded as to the manner of its communication, as the Nature of Man is. Every individual Man hath not only individual Properties, but an individual Nature, *i. e.* the common Nature of Man, limited by ſome unaccountable Principle, that doth make him different from all other Men having the ſame Nature with himſelf. The difficulty then doth not lie in a *Community* of *Nature*, and a *Diſtinction* of *Perſons*, for that is granted among Men, but in *the Unity of Nature* with the *difference* of *Perſons*. And ſuppoſing the Divine Nature to be infinite in its Perfection, I do not ſee how it is capable of being bounded, as the common Nature of Man in Individuals is; and if it be not capable of being bounded and limited, it muſt diffuſe it ſelf into all the Perſons in the ſame individual manner; and ſo this Doctrine of the *Trinity* is not repugnant to *Reaſon*.

*P.* But what ſay you to the *Athanaſian Creed*; is not that repugnant to humane Reaſon?

*Pr.* I think not; but that it is a juſt Explication of the Doctrine of the *Trinity* rightly underſtood.

*P.* I ſee now you are upon hard Points, you will ſtick at nothing, and *Tranſubſtantiation* it ſelf will down with you anon.

*Pr.* I doubt that; but at preſent we are upon the *Athanaſian Creed*. And I deſire but one Principle to clear it, which follows from what is ſaid already, *viz.* That what is affirmed of the Divine Nature, as ſuch, muſt be common to all three Perſons; but whatever is affirmed of the ſeveral Perſons, as ſuch, muſt be peculiar to themſelves. Now this is a clear Principle of Reaſon, and hath no appearance of abſurdity in it. And from hence the *Athanaſian Creed* will eaſily be cleared. For *Eternity*, *Incomprehenſibility*, *Omnipotency*, belonging to the Divine Nature, as ſuch, we ought to ſay, *That they are not Three Eternals*, *Three Incomprehenſibles*, *Three Almighties*, *but One Eternal*, *One Incomprehenſible*, *One Almighty*. Becauſe the Attributes belonging to the Perſons, by reaſon of the Divine Nature, and the Attributes being really the ſame with it, the Nature is the proper Subject of them, which being but One, we are not to diſtinguiſh them as to *Eſſential Attributes*, but only as to *Perſonal Relations* and *Properties*.

*P.* But if the Three Perſons be *Coëternal*, how is it poſſible to conceive there ſhould not be *Three Eternals?*

*Pr.* This ſeems the hardeſt Expreſſion in the whole Creed; but it is to be interpreted by the ſcope and deſign of it, which is, that the *Eſſential Attributes* are not to be diſtinguiſhed, though the *Perſons* be. And ſo *Eternity* is not taken as a *Perſonal Attribute*, but as *Eſſential*; and ſo they are not *three Eternals*, but *one Eternal*. And the great deſign of the Creed was, to ſhew, that the Chriſtian Church did not believe ſuch a Trinity as conſiſted of *three Perſons*, *unequal* and different in *Nature*, and *Subſtance*, and *Duration*.

*P.* But what ſay you to the damning all thoſe who do not believe it, in the beginning and end of it?

*Pr.* This is off from our buſineſs. But to let you ſee I will not avoid the difficulties you offer, I will give you an anſwer even to this. The meaning is not, that every one is damned who doth not conceive aright of the difference of Nature and Perſon in the Trinity, or of the Eſſential and Perſonal Attributes; but that thoſe who ſet up in oppoſition to it the worſhip of a mere Creature as God, or the worſhip of more Gods than one, or who wilfully reject this Article of the Chriſtian Faith, when it is duly propoſed to them, are guilty of a damning Sin. For even the diſbelief of Chriſtianity it ſelf, is not ſuppoſed to be the cauſe of Mens Damnation, but where the Doctrine of the Goſpel hath been propoſed in a way of credibility. If when this Doctrine of the *Trinity* is propoſed to Mens Minds, they will not conſider it, nor weigh the Arguments on both ſides impartially, but with ſcorn and contempt reject it, and endeavour to bring reproach upon Chriſtianity for the ſake of it, and diſturb the peace of the Church about it; ſuch cannot be ſaid to receive or *believe it faithfully*, and by ſuch Sins they do run the hazard of *periſhing everlaſtingly.*

*P.* I ſee you have a mind to ſmooth every thing relating to the *Trinity*, I wiſh you would do the ſame about *Tranſubſtantiation.* But yet you have not anſwer'd the other great difficulty in point of Reaſon, *viz. That thoſe things which agree or diſagree in a third, muſt agree or diſagree one with the other.* And therefore if the Father be God, the Son God, and the Holy Ghoſt God, then the Father muſt be Son and Holy Ghoſt, and the Son and Holy Ghoſt muſt be the Father. If not, then they are really the ſame, and really diſtinct; the ſame as to Eſſence, diſtinct as to Perſons; and ſo they are the ſame, and not the ſame, which is a Contradiction.

*Pr.* And now I think you have drawn out the moſt refined Spirits of *Socinianiſm*, to make the Doctrine of *the Trinity* and *Tranſubſtantiation* parallel, becauſe you ſay, it implies a Contradiction, which is the neareſt Parallel you have yet offered at. But this terrible Argument is grounded on the ſame Suppoſition, *viz.* That the Divine Eſſence is no more capable of communicating it ſelf to three diſtinct Perſons, than any created Being is. The Reaſon of that Axiom being, that created Things, by reaſon of their finite Nature, cannot diffuſe or communicate themſelves to more than one; and therefore thoſe which agree in a Third, muſt agree together; but ſuppoſing it poſſible that the ſame finite Nature could extend it ſelf to ſeveral Individuals, it would be preſently anſwered, the *Axiom* did hold only, where they did adequately and reciprocally agree, and not where they did agree only in Eſſence, but differ'd in the manner of Subſiſtence. For where a different manner of Subſiſtence is ſuppoſed poſſible, in the ſame individual Nature, the agreement in that cannot take away that difference which is conſiſtent with it, which we attribute to the unlimitedneſs and perfection of the Divine Nature.

*P.* But you can bring no other Inſtance but the thing in queſtion; and therefore this is a *Petitio Principii*, or taking that for granted which is in diſpute.

*Pr.* I do not think it to be ſo, where the Reaſon is aſſigned from the peculiar Properties of the Divine Nature, to which there can be no parallel. And I think it very unreaſonable in the *Socinians*, to ſend us to created Beings for the Rules and Meaſures of our Judgment concerning a Being acknowledged to be Infinite.

*P.* Are not the Divine Perſons Infinite, as well as the Divine Nature? and therefore as created Perſons do take in the whole Nature, ſo infinite Perſons will do the infinite Nature.

*Pr.* No queſtion, but the *Perſons* are infinite in regard of the *Nature* which is ſo; but if an infinite Nature be communicable to more Perſons than One, every ſuch Perſon cannot appropriate the whole Nature to it ſelf.

*P.* If the difference be on the account of Infinity, then there muſt be an infinite number of Perſons in the Divine Eſſence.

*Pr.* I anſwer, That Infiniteneſs of number is no Perfection; and as to the number of Perſons, we follow not our own Conjectures, nor the Authority of the Church; but *Divine Revelation*, which hath aſſured us, that there is but *one God*, and yet *there are three that are one*; which depends not merely on the place of St. *John*, but the Form of Baptiſm is remarkable to this purpoſe, which joins together *the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt*, without any other diſtinction beſides that of Order and Relation. And it is againſt the fundamental deſign of Chriſtianity, to join any created Beings together with God in ſo ſolemn an Act of Religion. And St. *Paul* joyns them together in his Benediction: *The Grace of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and the Love of God, and the Communion of the Holy Ghoſt be with you all. Amen.* 2 Cor. 12. 14. From whence the Chriſtian Church hath always believed a *Trinity* of *Perſons* in the *Unity* of the *Divine Nature.*

*P.* You have taken a great deal of pains to clear the Doctrine of the *Trinity* from any abſurdity in point of *Reaſon*, why ſhould you not do as much now as to *Tranſubſtantiation?*

*P.* In plain truth, becauſe I cannot; for here lies a vaſt difference between them. In the *Trinity* we conſidered an *Infinite Being*, to which no bounds can be ſet without deſtroying its Nature; but in *Tranſubſtantiation*, we ſuppoſe a true finite Body, which hath its natural bounds and limits to one certain Place, and yet you will and muſt ſuppoſe this Body to be equally preſent in many thouſand diſtant Places at the ſame time; which implies ſo great a Repugnancy to the very Nature of a Body, that I can by no means give my Aſſent to it.

*P.* Alas! Is this it which chokes your Reaſon, ſo that you cannot ſwallow the Doctrine of the Church in this matter?

You do not conſider, that tho' we allow nothing *Infinite* in the *Body* it ſelf; yet we ſuppoſe an *Infinite Power* to be imploy'd about it: and an Infinite Power may produce things above our Comprehenſions, about Bodies in themſelves finite.

*Pr.* This is the utmoſt your Cauſe will bear; but I pray tell me, Is there any ſuch thing as a Repugnancy in the Nature of things or not? *i. e.* Are there not ſome things which are endued with ſuch Properties, that if you alter them, you deſtroy their very Nature; as, to ſuppoſe an indiviſible Line, a Triangle without Lines, a Body without Dimenſions?

*P.* Hold a little; a Body muſt have Dimenſions belonging to it, but it is not neceſſary it ſhould have thoſe Dimenſions where-ever it is preſent. For it may be preſent in one Place *as a Body*, and in another *after the manner of a Spirit.*

*Pr.* You might as well have ſaid, a Body may be conſider'd two ways; as it is a Body, and as it is not a Body: for there can be no Body, where there are no Dimenſions proper to it.

*P.* See how you are miſtaken; for *it is not the Dimenſions which ſeem to hinder a Body being in more places at once, but its Unity*; as *Bellarmin* well obſerves.

*Pr.* I ſay both of them hinder. For a true Body can no more be without its Dimenſions, than a Line without Diviſibility.

*P.* I grant, that naturally it cannot, but *by Divine Power* it may.

*Pr.* Will you make the Power of God to change the Eſſential Properties of things, while the things themſelves remain in their true Nature? You may as well ſay, that naturally Man is a Reaſonable Creature; but, by Divine Power he may be a true Man, and yet want the Faculty of Reaſoning: That naturally two and two make four, but God can make two and two to be joyned together in a ſupernatural manner, ſo as that four ſhall not reſult from them; that tho', naturally ſpeaking, white-waſhing a Wall makes it look white, yet by an extraordinary Power, there may be the preſence of all things which make a Wall white, yet it ſhall not do ſo; juſt ſo it is to make a Body preſent, and yet to have no Dimenſions of a Body. Is there any real difference between the Nature of a Body and Spirit? Wherein lies it? Is it not as repugnant for a Body to be after the manner of a Spirit, as for a Body and Spirit to be the ſame?

*P.* All this proceeds upon not conſidering the difference between the *Eſſential Extenſion* of a *Body*, and that which is *quantitative, and hath relation to Place.*

*Pr.* The *Eſſential Extenſion* of a Body without *Quantity*, is Non-ſenſe, and a Contradiction. For it is to make a Body extended and not extended, at the ſame time. I pray tell me what you mean by *a Body*, as it is oppoſed to *a Spirit?*

*P.* I mean as all Mankind do, ſuch a Subſtance which conſiſts of Parts extended and diviſible.

*Pr.* Then being extended and diviſible, are the natural and eſſential Properties of a Body. And therefore, to ſuppoſe a Body not to be extended and diviſible, is to ſuppoſe it not to be a Body, which is a plain Contradiction.

*P.* You are to diſtinguiſh between *the Intrinſecal Quantity*, which is an inſeparable Property of a Body, and the *Extrinſecal Relation* it hath to a Place.

*Pr. Intrinſecal Quantity* without Relation to Place, is *intrinſecal Nonſenſe.* For, how is it poſſible for extended Parts to have no Relation to Place?

*P.* By *Relation to Place*, I mean, when the Parts of a Body anſwer to the Parts of a Place: but by *Intrinſecal Quantity*, I mean, that there is the real order and proportion of Parts in the Body it ſelf, but it doth not fill up the Place.

*Pr.* Then you do ſuppoſe the Body of Chriſt in the Euchariſt, to have all the diſtinct Parts of a Body, with their due Order and Proportion, but to be in the Sacrament after an indiviſible manner.

*P.* Why not?

*Pr.* Do you think it poſſible for the real and entire Body of a Man to be crouded into the compaſs of a Wafer, with all the difference of its Parts, ſo that no true Part of the Body be miſſing?

*P.* Yes, by Divine Power.

*Pr.* Do

*Pr.* Do you think a far leſs thing poſſible than that, *viz.* that a Man's Head and Shoulders, and Arms, ſhould be contained entire and diſtinct under the Nail of his little Finger?

*P.* Why not?

*Pr.* Then why may not the greateſt Body be within the leaſt? Why may not an Elephant be caught in a Mouſe-trap, and a Rhinoceros be put into a Snuff-box? For either there is a Repugnancy in the Nature of the thing, for a greater Body to be within a leſs, or there is not; if not, then theſe mentioned Inſtances are poſſible; if there be, then the ſuppoſition of Divine Power can give no relief, unleſs you ſuppoſe, that God can do things repugnant in themſelves, *i. e.* that he can do things which cannot be done. But I pray tell me, if the very Body of Chriſt be by *Tranſubſtantiation* in the Wafer, with all its Parts in their due order, then the Head muſt be diſtant from the Feet, and all the other *Organs* in their proper places; but this cannot poſſibly be ſuppoſed, where there is no meaſure of diſtance as *Place* is, and the whole Body is in a point.

*P.* I ſay again, there is the juſt order of Parts conſidered *in themſelves*, but not *with reſpect to Place.*

*Pr.* Then it is impoſſible there ſhould be any diſtance; without which it is impoſſible there ſhould be the order of Parts in a Human Body. Thus, there is a Repugnancy in the very ſuppoſition of Chriſt's Body being in the Wafer, tho' there were but one ſingle Wafer; but when to this we add, that it is equally thus preſent in thouſands of Wafers at what diſtance of Place ſoever, the Abſurdities do increaſe and multiply ſo faſt upon us, that it is hardly poſſible to imagin any thing concerning a Body, which doth imply more than this doth. As that *one* and the ſame Body ſhould be indiviſibly preſent in many places, where it muſt be divided from it ſelf, by ſo many Bodies interpoſing: ſo that it is impoſſible to apprehend how two Bodies can be divided from one another more effectually, than ſuch a Body muſt be from it ſelf, if it be preſent in many places at once.

*P.* I pray ſtop here; for reckon up as many Abſurdities as you will, they are all but the Effects of *Carnal Reaſon*, and we muſt *captivate our Underſtanding to the Obedience of Faith.*

*Pr.* Then it is to no purpoſe to argue any farther, on the point of *Reaſon*; and I thought you deſigned this for one part of your *Parallel.*

*P.* So I did; and I ſtill ſay, there are things as hard to make out about the *Trinity*, which you have not yet taken notice of.

*Pr.* I pray let us hear them, that we may put an end to this Diſcourſe.

*P.* What ſay you then to one and the ſame Nature being in three diſtinct Perſons, which *Bellarmin* ſaith, *is more wonderful, than that one Body ſhould be in many Places; becauſe the Nature is identified with the Perſons, but the Body is not ſo with the Places in which it is preſent.* If therefore the ſame Nature be not divided from it ſelf in the Perſons of the Trinity, how much more eaſily may one Body be preſent in ſeveral places, and not be divided from it ſelf?

*Pr.* It is ſtrange neither *Bellarmin* nor you ſhould diſcern the difference. For the reaſon why a Body muſt be divided from it ſelf, being in ſeveral places, is, becauſe it is finite; and there being no Penetration of Dimenſions in Bodies, the interpoſing of other Bodies muſt needs

divide

divide the ſame Body in diſtant places; but the Reaſon why the ſame Divine Nature may be in ſeveral Perſons, is, becauſe it is Infinite; and therefore nothing can bound or diſcontinue it.

*P.* You have talked much of Contradictions; Is there any greater about Tranſubſtantiation, than that of *Eternal Generation* of the Son in the *Myſtery* of the *Trinity?* for, if it be not *proper Generation*, then you cannot infer from it, that *the Son is of the ſame Subſtance with the Father*; if it be, then it muſt be a proceeding from not being to being, and ſo *an Eternal Generation* is a Contradiction.

*Pr.* It is a Rule in common Reaſon, That all Attributes muſt be underſtood according to the Nature of the Subjects. And therefore, if the Subject here ſpoken of be of ſuch a Nature, as to be uncapable of proceeding from *not being to being*, then whatever is affirmed of it, muſt be ſo underſtood, as not to deſtroy its Nature. The Term of Generation alone is not, it may be, ſufficient to prove the Son Co-eſſential with the Father, becauſe it might have been uſed improperly and metaphorically. But when from the Scripture, it otherwiſe appears that the Son of God being *the Word*, *was in the beginning with God*, *and was God*, John 1. 1. and we ſoon after find him called *the only begotten of the Father*, Ver. 14. and *the only begotten Son*, Ver. 18. we have reaſon to infer from hence his *Eternal Generation.* Which muſt not be underſtood in ſuch a mean ſenſe as is agreeable to Creatures, but as it is conſiſtent with the Eſſential Attributes of God, of which neceſſary Exiſtence is one. So that by Eternal Generation, no more can be meant, than ſuch an Emanation of the Son from the Father, as doth ſuppoſe them to have the ſame Nature and Co-exiſtence: which is beſt repreſented by the Rays of the Sun coming from the Fountain of Light, if they were permanent, and not ſucceſſive.

*P.* What ſay you then to the *Myſtery* of the *Incarnation? Is it not more wonderful*, as *Bellarmin* obſerves, *that there ſhould be one Hypoſtaſis in two Natures, than one Body in two Places? ſince the Union is greater between the Hypoſtaſis and the Natures, than between the Body and the Places it is in; the one being intrinſecal and ſubſtantial, the other extrinſecal and accidental. And that Hypoſtaſis is the ſame with the Divine Nature, and yet is moſt cloſely united with the Human Nature, which is ſo different from the Divine; ſo that it is incomprehenſible by us, how in that Union the Natures are not confounded, or the Hypoſtaſis divided.*

*Pr.* Suppoſe now we grant all this, that there is an incomprehenſible Myſtery in the *Incarnation*, what follows from thence? Have I not hitherto owned, that there muſt be ſomething incomprehenſible by us, in what relates to the Divine Nature? And it is the leſs wonder it is ſo in the *Incarnation*, wherein an Union is implied between an Infinite and Finite Nature; when the Union of the Soul and Body, though both Finite, is above our Comprehenſion, though we our ſelves conſiſt of Souls and Bodies ſo united? But what Conſequence is it, if we are not able to explain this, that then we muſt admit that the ſame Body may be not merely in two, but in ten thouſand places at the ſame time? *i. e.* If we cannot explain the *Hypoſtatical Union*, then all manner of Abſurdities muſt go down with us, that relate to things of a very different Nature from it.

*P.* I am glad to find you are ſet at laſt, and that now you have a Difficulty before you which you can never get through.

*Pr.* Be not too confident; I have only hitherto denied the Conſequence as to the Difficulties of *Tranſubſtantiation*. But it is poſſible, that ſetting aſide the Confuſion of *School-Terms*, I may be able to give a far more intelligible and reaſonable Account of the *Incarnation* it ſelf, than you can ever do of *Tranſubſtantiation*.

*P.* Firſt ſhew that it is poſſible, and then explain the manner of it.

*Pr.* But let us in the firſt place agree what we mean by it.

*P.* By the *Incarnation*, I mean, the Union of the Divine and Humane Nature, ſo as to make one Perſon in Chriſt.

*Pr.* If this be not poſſible, it muſt either be, 1. Becauſe two Natures different from each other, cannot be united to make one Perſon: The contrary whereof appears in the Union of Soul and Body to the Perſon of a Man. Or, 2. Becauſe it is impoſſible that an Infinite Nature ſhould be united to a Finite.

*P.* How can there be an Union poſſible, between two Beings infinitely diſtant from each other?

*Pr.* Not in that reſpect wherein the *Diſtance* is *Infinite*; but if there be nothing deſtructive to either Nature in ſuch an Union, and the Infinite Nature do condeſcend to it, why may it not be ſo united to an Intelligent Finite Being, as to make one Perſon together with it? For in reſpect of Union, the Diſtance is not ſo great between *Finite* and *Infinite*, as between *Body* and *Spirit*.

*P.* The Diſtance is Infinite in one Caſe, but not in the other.

*Pr.* I do not ſpeak of them, with reſpect to *Perfections*, but to *Union*; and an infinite Diſtance in that muſt imply an abſolute Repugnancy, which you can never prove: For, ſince *Body* and *Spirit* may be united to make one Perſon, an Infinite Spirit may be united to a Finite Nature.

*P.* But the manner of the *Hypoſtatical Union* is impoſſible to be conceived.

*Pr.* Let the thing be granted poſſible, and the difficulty of conceiving the manner may be as great in the Union of Soul and Body. Will you undertake to explain that to me? and yet I hope you believe it. But, let us hear your Difficulties again, which you object from *Bellarmine*.

*P. That there ſhould be but one Hypoſtaſis in two Natures; and that in the Union the Natures ſhould not be confounded, nor the Hypoſtaſis divided.*

*Pr.* All theſe Difficulties ariſe from the ſenſe of the word *Hypoſtaſis*. Which originally ſignifies *a Real Being*, and not ſuch which depends only on Fancy and Imagination; from thence its ſignification was enlarged, not only to *things real*, (in oppoſition to mere Appearances, and Creatures of the Mind) but to ſuch a thing *which did ſubſiſt of it ſelf*, and had not its ſubſiſtence in another, as Accidents had. So that an *Hypoſtaſis* was *a real Subſtance which had ſubſiſtence in it ſelf*. But ſuch are of two kinds, as the Greek Fathers obſerve. (1.) Such as are real Subſtances in themſelves, but yet are capable of being joined with another, to make up a Perſon; thus the *Soul* and *Body* have two different *Hypoſtaſes*, and make up but

*one*

*one Perſon* of a Man. (2.) It is taken, for a *compleat individual Subſiſtence, which is not joined with any other as a Part*; and ſo *Hypoſtaſis* is the ſame with *a Perſon*, which is nothing elſe but *a compleat, intelligent, individual Hypoſtaſis.* And in this ſenſe there can be but one *Hypoſtaſis* in Chriſt, *i. e.* one Perſon, tho' there be two Natures.

*P.* But our Divines ſay, that the Human Nature after the Union hath no *Hypoſtaſis*, it being ſwallowed up by the Divine.

*Pr.* I know they do; but if they mean that the Humane Nature, after the Union, loſes that *ſubſiſtence* which is proper to the *Humane Nature*, it is impoſſible for them to avoid the *Eutychian Hereſy*, condemned by the Council of *Chalcedon*; but if they mean no more than that there is *a true Nature*, but no Perſon, ſave only that which reſults from both Natures; they then agree with the Senſe of the Church, which condemned the *Eutychians.* For as much as the Hereſies of *Neſtorius* and *Eutyches* differ'd in themſelves, they were both built on the ſame Ground, *viz.* that there could be no true Nature, but there muſt be a Perſon; and that two Natures could not make one Perſon. From whence *Neſtorius* aſſerted there were *two Perſons in Chriſt*; and *Eutyches* denied that there were *two Natures.*

*P.* What doth all this ſignify, but that the Authority of the Church muſt determine whether there be *two Natures*, or *two Perſons* in Chriſt?

*Pr.* It ſeems then, the whole Buſineſs wherein the General Councils were ſo warmly concerned, was only to make an *Eccleſiaſtical Dictionary*, and to appoint what words are to be uſed, and what not. Do you think then, there were no ſuch *real Hereſies* as *Neſtorianiſm* and *Eutychianiſm*, but only they happened to take the words *Nature* and *Perſon* in another ſenſe than the Church would have Men uſe them?

*P.* I truſt the Church for all theſe things.

*Pr.* Then if the Church would have you affirm *two Perſons* and *one Nature*, or *two Natures* and *one Perſon*, it were all one to you.

*P.* Why not? ſince the Church muſt determine.

*Pr.* What if you had been to diſpute with *Neſtorius* and *Eutyches?*

*P.* I would have told them, they muſt ſubmit to the *Church* about the uſe of words.

*Pr.* And they would have laughed at you for your pains: For the Controverſy was really about the *Truth* of *Chriſt's Incarnation*, (as the Fathers proved, and the Councils determined) which in Conſequence was rejected by both of them; as I will evidently prove, if you have any longer Patience.

*P.* I beg your pardon, Sir, I have heard enough of all Conſcience already.

*Pr.* I think ſo too, to make you aſhamed of your Parallel between the *Doctrine of the Trinity, and Tranſubſtantiation.*

And methinks, for the ſake of our common Chriſtianity, you ſhould no more venture upon ſuch bold and unreaſonable Compariſons. Do you in earneſt think, it is all one, whether Men do be-

lieve a God, or Providence, or Heaven, or Hell, or the Trinity and Incarnation of Chriſt, if they do not believe *Tranſubſtantiation?* We have heard much of late about *Old* and *New Popery*; but if this be the way of *Repreſenting New Popery*, by expoſing the common Articles of Faith, it will ſet the Minds of all good Chriſtians farther from it than ever. For upon the very ſame Grounds, we may expect another Parallel between the *belief of a God* and *Tranſubſtantiation*; the effect of which will be, the expoſing of all Religion. This is a very deſtructive and miſchievous Method of Proceeding; but our comfort is, that it is very *unreaſonable*; as I hope, hath fully appeared by this Diſcourſe.

THE

# AN ANSWER TO SOME PAPERS

Lately Printed, concerning the

# AUTHORITY OF THE Catholick Church IN MATTERS of FAITH, and the REFORMATION of the CHURCH of ENGLAND.

## AN ADVERTISEMENT.

IF *the* Papers, *here answered, had not been so publickly dispersed through the Nation, a due Respect to the Name they bear, would have kept the Author from publishing any Answer to them. But because they may now fall into many hands, who without some assistance may not readily resolve some difficulties started by them, He thought it not unbecoming his duty to God and the King, to give a clearer light to the Things contained in them. And it can be no reflection on the Authority of a Prince, for a private Subject to examine a piece of Coyn as to its just value, though it bears His* Image *and* Superscription *upon it. In matters that concern* Faith *and* Salvation, *we must* prove all things, and hold fast that which is good.

# AN ANSWER TO THE *FIRST PAPER.*

IF all men could *believe as they pleaſed*, I ſhould not have fail'd of ſatisfaction in this *Firſt Paper*; the Deſign of it being to put an end *to Particular Diſputes*; to which I am ſo little a Friend, that I could have been glad to have found, as much reaſon in it to convince, as I ſaw there was a fair appearance to deceive. But there is a *Law in our Minds* diſtinct from that of our *Inclinations*; and out of a juſt and due regard to That, we muſt examine the moſt plauſible Writings, though back'd with the greateſt Authority, before we yield our Aſſent unto them.

If particular Controverſies about *Matters of Faith* could be ended by a Principle, *as viſible as that the Scripture is in Print*, all men of ſence would ſoon give over Diſputing; for none who dare believe what they ſee, can call that in Queſtion. But what if *the Church*, whoſe *Authority*, it is ſaid, *they muſt ſubmit to*, will not allow them to believe what they ſee? How then can this be a ſufficient reaſon to perſuade them to believe the Church, *becauſe it is as viſible as that the Scripture is in Print?* unleſs we muſt only uſe our ſenſes to find out the Church, and renounce them aſſoon as we have done it. Which is a very bad requital of them, and no great Honour to the Church which requires it.

But with all due ſubmiſſion, it is no more *viſible* that the *Roman Church is the Catholick Church*, than it is, that a *part* is *the whole*, and the moſt corrupt part, that *one Church*, *which Chriſt hath here upon Earth.*

It is agreed among all Chriſtians, That Chriſt can *have but one Church upon Earth*, as there is *but one Lord*, *one Faith*, *one Baptiſm.* And this is that Church *we profeſs to believe in the two Creeds.* But if thoſe, *who made thoſe Creeds for our direction*, had intended the *Roman Catholick Church*, why was it not ſo expreſſed? How came it to paſs that ſuch a limitation of the ſenſe of Chriſt's *Catholick Church* to the *Roman*, ſhould never be put to Perſons to be Baptized in any Age of the Church? For I do not find in the Office of Baptiſm, even in the *Roman Church*, that it is required that they believe the *Roman Catholick Church*, or that they deny the validity of Baptiſm out of the Communion of the *Roman Church.* From whence it is to me as *viſible as that the Scripture is in Print*, that the Church of *Rome* it ſelf doth not believe that it is, *the one Catholick Church mentioned in the two Creeds.* For then it muſt void all Baptiſm out of its Communion, which it hath never yet done. And as long as Baptiſm doth enter Perſons into the Catholick Church,

it

it is impossible, that all who have the true form of Baptism, though out of the Communion of the *Roman Church*, should be Members of the *Catholick Church*, and yet the Communion of the *Roman* and *Catholick* be all one; as it must be if the *Roman Church*, be the *Catholick and Apostolick Church professed in the Creeds.*

If we had been so happy to have lived in those Blessed Times, *when the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and of one soul*, it had been no difficulty to have shewed that *one visible Church, which Christ had here upon Earth.* But they must be great strangers to the History of the Church, who have not heard of the early and great Divisions in the Communion of it. And there was a remarkable difference in the Nature of those Schisms, which happened in the Church; which being not considered hath been the occasion of great misapplication of the sayings of the Ancients about the *One Catholick Church.* Some did so break off Communion with other parts of the *Catholick Church*, as to challenge that Title wholly to themselves; as was evident in the case of the *Novatians* and *Donatists*; for they rebaptiz'd all that embrac'd their Communion. Others were cast out of Communion upon particular differences; which were not supposed to be of such a nature, as to make them no members of the *Catholick Church.* So the Bishops of *Rome* excommunicated the Bishops of *Asia* for not keeping *Easter* when They did; and the Bishops both of *Asia* and *Africa*, for not allowing the Baptism of Hereticks. But is it reasonable to suppose, that upon these Differences they shut out all those Holy Bishops and Martyrs from the possibility of Salvation, by excluding them from their Communion? If not, then there may be different Communions among Christians, which may still continue *Parts* of the *Catholick Church*; and consequently no one Member of such a Division ought to assume to it self the *Title* and *Authority* of the *One Catholick Church.* But if any *One Part* doth so, though never so great and conspicuous, it is guilty of the same Presumption with the *Novatians* and *Donatists*, and is as much cause of the Schisms, which happen thereupon in the Church, as they were.

For a long time before the Reformation, there had been great and considerable breaches, between the *Eastern* and *Western Churches*; insomuch that they did renounce each others Communion. And in these Differences four *Patriarchal Churches* joined together against the fifth, *viz.* that of the Bishop of *Rome.* But the Eastern Patriarchs sinking in their Power, by the horrible Invasion of the Enemies of the Christian Faith; and the Bishops of *Rome* advancing themselves to so much Authority, by the advantages they took from the kindness of some Princes, and the *Weakness* of others, They would hear of no other terms of accommodation with the Eastern Churches, but by an intire submission to the *Pope as Head of the Catholick Church.* Which all the Churches of the East refused, however different among themselves; and to this day look on the Pope's Supremacy as an Innovation in the Church, and Usurpation on the Rights of the other Patriarchs and Bishops. In all those Churches the *Two Creeds are professed*, true Baptism administred, and an undoubted Succession of Bishops from the Apostles; How then come they to be excluded from being *Parts* of the *One Catholick and Apostolick Church?* And if they be not excluded, how can the *Roman Church* assume to it self that glorious Title? So that it seems to me *as visible as that the Scripture is in Print*, that the *Roman*

*Church* neither is, nor can be that *One Church*, which Christ left upon Earth.

And this Principle being removed (which ought to be taken for granted, since it can never be proved) we must unavoidably *enter into the Ocean of Particular Disputes.* And I know no reason any can have to be so afraid of it, since we have so sure a Compass, as the Holy Scripture to direct our passage. But the reason of avoiding *particular Disputes* is, because the evidence is too clear in them, that the *Church* of *Rome* hath notoriously deviated from this infallible Rule. And it is as impossible for a Church, which hath erred, to be Infallible, as for a Church really Infallible, to err. But if a Church pretend to prove her Infallibility by Texts, which are not so clear, as those which prove her to have actually erred; then we have greater reason to recede from her Errors, than to be deceived with such a fallible pretence to Infallibility.

Well! *But it is not left to every phantastical man's head to believe as he pleases, but to the Church.*

And is it indeed left to the Church *to believe as it pleases?* But the meaning I suppose is, that those, who reject the Authority of the Roman Catholick Church, do leave every man to believe according to his own fancy. Certainly those of the *Church* of *England*, cannot be liable to any imputation of this Nature. For *our Church* receives the three Creeds, and embraces the four General Councils, and professes to hold nothing contrary to any Universal Tradition of the Church from the Apostles times. And we have often offered to put the Controversies between *Us* and the *Church* of *Rome* upon that issue. And do not those rather *believe as they please*, who believe the *Roman Church* to be the *Catholick Church*, without any colour from Scriptures, Antiquity or Reason? Do not *those believe as they please*, who can believe against the most convincing Evidence of their own senses? Do not *those believe as they please*, who can reconcile the lawfulness of the Worship of Images, with God's forbidding it, the Communion in one kind with Christ's Institution, and the praying in an unknown Tongue with the fourteenth *Chapter* of the first Epistle to the *Corinthians?*

But all these and many other Absurdities may go down by vertue of the Church's Authority, *to whom*, it is said, *Christ left the Power upon Earth to govern us in matters of Faith.* We do not deny that the Church hath Authority of declaring matters of Faith, or else it never could have condemn'd the ancient Heresies. But then we must consider the difference between the *Universal Church* in a General and free Council, declaring the sense of Scripture in Articles of Faith, generally received in the Christian Church from the Apostles Times, as was done when the *Nicene Creed* was made; and a Faction in the Church assuming to it self the Title of *Catholick*, and proceeding by other rules, than the first Councils did, and imposing new Opinions and Practices, as things necessary to the Communion of the *Catholick Church.* And this is the true Point in difference between us and those of the Roman Church, about the *Church's Authority* in matters of Faith, since the *Council of Trent.* For we think we have very great reason to complain, when a Party in the Church, the most corrupt and obnoxious, takes upon it self

ſelf to define many new Doctrines, as neceſſary Points of Faith, which have neither Scripture, nor Univerſal Tradition for them.

*It were a very irrational thing*, we are told, *to make Laws for a Country, and leave it to the Inhabitants to be Interpreters and Judges of thoſe Laws; for then every Man will be his own Judge, and by conſequence, no ſuch thing as either Right or Wrong.*

But is it not as *irrational* to allow an *Uſurper* to interpret the *Laws* to his own advantage, againſt the juſt Title of the Prince, and the true Intereſt of the People? And if it be not reaſonable for any private Perſon to be *his own Judge*, why ſhould a publick Invader be ſo? But we hope it will be allowed to the Loyal Inhabitants of a Country, ſo far *to interpret the Laws*, as to be able to underſtand the Duty they owe to their King, and to juſtifie his Right againſt all the Pretences of Uſurpers. And this is as much as we plead for in this caſe.

*Can we therefore ſuppoſe, That God Almighty would leave us at thoſe uncertainties, as to give us a Rule to go by, and leave every Man to be his own Judge?*

And can we reaſonably ſuppoſe, *That God Almighty ſhould give us a Rule* not capable of being underſtood by thoſe *to whom it was given*, in order to the great End of it, *viz.* the ſaving of their Souls? For this was the main end of the Rule, to direct us in the way to Heaven, and not merely to determine Controverſies. The Staff, which a Man uſes, may ſerve to meaſure things by, but the principal deſign is to walk with it. So it is with the Holy Scripture, if Controverſies ariſe: It is fit to examine and compare them with this infallible Rule; but when that is done, to help us in our way to Heaven, is that which it was chiefly intended for. And no Man can think it of equal conſequence to him, not to be miſtaken, and not to be damned. In matters of Good and Evil, every Man's Conſcience is his immediate Judge, and why not in matters of Truth and Falſhood? Unleſs we ſuppoſe Mens involuntary Miſtakes to be more dangerous than their wilful Sins.

But after all, *We do not leave every Man to be his own Judge*, any farther than it concerns his own Salvation, which depends upon his particular care and ſincerity. For to prevent any dangerous Miſtakes by the artifice of Seducers, we do allow the aſſiſtance of thoſe ſpiritual Guides, which God hath appointed in his Church, for the better inſtructing and governing private Perſons: We embrace the ancient Creeds, as a ſummary comprehenſion of the Articles of Faith; and think no Man ought to follow his own particular Fancy, againſt Doctrines ſo univerſally received in the Chriſtian Church, from the Apoſtles Times.

*I do aſk any ingenuous Man, whether it be not the ſame thing, to follow our own Fancy, or to interpret Scripture by it.*

If we allowed no Creeds, no Fathers, no Councils, there might have been ſome colour for ſuch a Queſtion. But do we permit Men to interpret Scripture according to their own Fancy, who live in a Church, which owns the Doctrine of the Primitive Church more frankly and ingenuouſly,

genuously, than any Church in the World besides, without setting up any private Spirit against it, or the present *Roman Church* to be the Interpreter of it. And now I hope I may have leave to ask some Questions of any ingenuous Man; as, Whether it be not the same thing for the Church of *Rome* to make the Rule, as to assume to it self the sole Power of giving the sense of it? For what can a Rule signifie without the sense? And if this were the intention of Almighty God, had it not been as necessary to have told us, to whom he had given the Power of interpreting the Rule, as to have given the Rule it self? Whether it be reasonable for the Church of *Rome*, to interpret those Texts, wherein this power of interpreting is to be contained? For this is to make it *Judge in its own Cause*, which was thought an absurdity before. And whether it be not as mischievous to allow a prosperous Usurper the power of interpreting Laws, according to his own Interest, as any private Person, according to his own Fancy? Whether it be possible to reform Disorders in the Church, when the Person principally accused is supreme Judge? Whether those can be indifferent Judges in Councils, who before-hand take an Oath, to defend that Authority which is to be debated? Whether *Tradition* be not as uncertain a Rule, as Fancy, when Men judge of Tradition according to their Fancy?

*I would have any Man shew me, where the Power of deciding matters of Faith is given to every particular Man.*

If by *deciding matters of Faith* be understood the determining them in such a manner, as to oblige others, I do not know where it is given to every particular Man, nor how it should be. For then *every particular Man* would have a power over *every particular Man*; and there would want a new decision, whose should take place. But if *by deciding matters of Faith*, no more be meant, but every Man's being satisfied of the Reasons, why he believes one thing to be true, and not another; that belongs to *every Man*, as he is bound to take care of his Soul, and must give an account both to God and Man of the Reason of his Faith. And what can be meant in Scripture by *Proving all things, and holding fast that which is good*, 1 Thess. 5. 21. *By trying the Spirits, whether they be of God*, 1 John 4. 1. *By judging of themselves what is right*, Luke 12. 57. unless God hath given to Mankind a Faculty of discerning Truth and Falshood in Matters of Faith. But if every Man hath not such a Power, how comes he to be satisfied about the Church's Authority? Is not that a matter of Faith? And where ever any person will shew me, that every Man hath a Power to determine his Faith in that matter, I'll undertake to shew him the rest.

*Christ left his Power to his Church, even to forgive Sins in Heaven, and left his Spirit with them, which they exercised after his Resurrection.*

But where then was the *Roman Catholick Church?* And how can it be hence inferred, That these Powers are now in the Church of *Rome*, exclusive to all others, unless it be made appear that it was *Heir-General* to *all the Apostles?* I suppose it will be granted, that the Apostles had some Gifts of the Spirit, which the Church of *Rome* will not in modesty pretend to; such as the Gift of Tongues, the Spirit of Discerning, Prophesie,

Propheſie, miraculous Cures and Puniſhments. Now, here lies the difficulty, to ſhew what part of the Promiſe of the infallible Spirit (for the ordinary *Power of the Keys* relates not to this matter) was to expire with the Apoſtles, and what was to be continued to the Church in all Ages. A Promiſe of Divine Aſſiſtance is denied by none but *Pelagians:* But how far that extends, is the Queſtion. In the Souls of good Men it is ſo as to keep them in the way to Heaven, but not to prevent any lapſe into ſin; and it were worth our knowing, where God hath ever promiſed to keep any Men more from Error, than from Sin. Doth he hate one more than the other? Is one more diſagreeing to the Chriſtian Doctrine than the other? How came then ſo much to be ſaid for the keeping Men from Error, when at the ſame time, they confeſs they may not only commit great Sins, but err very dangerouſly in the moſt ſolemn manner, in what relates to the Doctrine of Manners. Would any have believed the Apoſtles infallible, if they had known them to be Perſons of ill Lives; or that they had notoriouſly erred in ſome Rules of great conſequence to the welfare of Mankind? Now, all this is freely yielded, as to the pretence of Infallibility in the Church of *Rome.* It is granted, that the Guides of that Church have been very bad Men; and that in Councils they have frequently erred about the depoſing Power, being only a *Matter of Practice*, and not of Faith. Whether it be ſo or not, I now diſpute not; but it is granted, that notwithſtanding this infallible Spirit, the *Roman Church* may groſly err in a matter of mighty conſequence to the Peace of Chriſtendom; and yet it cannot err in decreeing the leaſt matters of Faith. As for inſtance, it can by no means err about the *ſeven Sacraments*, or the *Intention of the Prieſt about them*; but it may err about *Depoſing Princes*, and *Abſolving Subjects from their allegiance*; which in eaſier terms is, They can never err about their own Intereſt, but they may about any other whatſoever

I paſs over the next Paragraph, the ſenſe being imperfect, and what is material about the Creeds, hath been ſpoken to already.

That which next deſerves conſideration, is,

*That the Church was the Judge even of the Scripture it ſelf, many years after the Apoſtles, which Books were Canonical, and which were not.*

We have a diſtinction among us of *Judges* of the *Law*, and *Judges* of the *Fact:* The One declares what the *Law* is, the *Fact* being ſuppoſed; the Other gives judgment upon the *Fact*, as it appears before them. Now in this caſe about the *Canonical Books*, the Church is not judge of the Law. For they are not to declare whether a Book appearing to be *Canonical* ought by it to be received for *Canonical*, (which is taken for granted among all Chriſtians) but all they have to do, is to give Judgment upon the matter of Fact, *i. e.* whether it appear upon ſufficient evidence to have been a Book written by Divine Inſpiration. And the *Church* of *Rome* hath no particular privilege in this matter, but gives its Judgment as other parts of the Chriſtian World do: And if it takes upon it to judge contrary to the general ſenſe of the Chriſtian Church, we are not to be concluded by it; but an Appeal lies to a greater Tribunal of the Univerſal Church.

*And if they had this Power, then I desire to know, how they came to lose it?*

Who are meant by *They?* And what is understood by *this Power?* It is one thing for a Part of the Church to give Testimony to a matter of Fact, and another to assume the Power of making Books *Canonical*, which were not so. This latter no Church in the World hath, and therefore can never lose it. The former is only Matter of Testimony, and all parts of the Church are concerned in it, and it depends as other Matters of Fact do, on the Skill and Fidelity of the Reporters.

*And by what Authority Men separate themselves from that Church?*

What Church? The Catholick and Apostolick. We own no Separation from that; but we are dis-joyned from the Communion of the *Roman Church*, that we may keep up the stricter Union with the truly *Catholick* and *Apostolick Church*. And this is no *Separating our selves*, but being cast out by an Usurping Faction in the Church; because we would not submit to the unreasonable Conditions of Communion imposed by it; the chief whereof is owning all the Usurpation, which hath by degrees been brought into it. To make this plain by an Example: Suppose a prosperous Usurper in this Kingdom had gained a considerable Interest in it, and challenged a Title to the whole, and therefore required of all the King's Subjects, within his Power, to own him to be Rightful King: Upon this, many of them are forced to withdraw, because they will not own his Title: Is this an act of *Rebellion*, and not rather of true Loyalty? Schism in the Church is like Rebellion in the State. The Pope declares himself *Head* of the *Catholick Church*, and hath formed himself a kind of Spiritual Kingdom in the West; altho' the other parts of the Christian World declare against it, as an Usurpation. However, he goes on, and makes the owning his Power a necessary Condition of being of his Communion. This many of the Western Parts, as well as Eastern, disown and reject, and therefore are excluded Communion with that Church, whereof he is owned to be the *Head*. The Question now is, Who gives the Occasion to this Separation? whether the Pope, by requiring the owning his Usurpation, or We, by declaring against it? Now, if the Conditions, he requires, be unjust and unreasonable; if his Authority, he challenges, over the *Catholick Church*, be a mere Usurpation (for which we have not only the Consent of the other Parts of the Christian World, but of Scripture and the Ancient Church) then we are not to be condemned, for such a Separation, which was unavoidable, if we would not comply with the Pope's Usurpation. And upon this Foot the Controversie about Schism stands between Us and the Church of *Rome*.

*The only Pretence I ever heard of, was, because the Church hath fail'd in wresting and interpreting the Scripture contrary to the true sense and meaning of it; and that they have imposed Articles of Faith upon us, which are not to be warranted by God's Word. I do desire to know who is to be Judge of that, whether the whole Church, the Succession whereof hath continued to this day without interruption; or particular Men, who have raised Schisms for their own advantage.*

The whole force of this Paragraph depends upon a Supposition, which is taken for granted, but will never be yielded by Us, and we are sure can never be proved by those of the *Church* of *Rome*, *viz.* That in the new imposed Articles, the *whole Church* in a continued Succession hath been of the same judgment with them, and only some *few Particular Men* in these last Ages have opposed them. Whereas the great thing we insist upon next to the Holy Scripture, is, that they can never prove the Points in difference, by an Universal Tradition from the Apostles Times, either as to the *Papal Supremacy*, or the other Articles defined by the *Council of Trent*. We do not take upon our selves to contradict the Universal sense of the Christian Church from the Apostles Times in any one Point. But the true Reason of the proceeding of the *Church* of *England* was this. While the Pope's Authority was here received and obeyed, there was no liberty of searching into abuses, or the ways of Reforming them. But when Men were encouraged to look into the Scripture, and Fathers, and Councils, they soon found the state of things in the Church extremely altered from what they ought to have been, or had been in the Primitive Church: But they saw no possibility of Redress, as long as the Pope's Authority was so absolute and inviolable. This therefore in the first place they set themselves to the accurate Examination of; and the Result was, that they could find it neither in the Scriptures, nor Fathers, nor Councils, nor owned by the Eastern Churches: And therefore they concluded it ought to be laid aside, as an Usurpation. Our Church being by this means set free (even with the consent of Those, who joyned with the Church of *Rome* in other things) a greater liberty was then used in examining particular Doctrines and Practices, which had crept into the Church by degrees, when Ignorance and Barbarism prevail'd; and having finish'd this enquiry, Articles of Religion were drawn up, wherein the sense of our Church was delivered, agreeable to Scripture and Antiquity, though different from the Modern Church of *Rome*; and these Articles are not the private sense of particular Men, but the Publick Standard whereby the World may judge, what we believe and practise; and therefore these are the sense of our Church, and not the opinions or fancies of particular Men. And those who call the retrenching the Pope's exorbitant Power by the name of Schism, must by parity of reason call the casting off an Usurper Rebellion. But certainly those who consider the mighty advantages and privileges of the *Clergy* in the *Church* of *Rome*, can never reasonably suspect any of that Order should hope to better themselves by the Reformation. And if we judge of Mens actings by their Interest, one of the most surprizing considerations at this day is, that the *Clergy* should be *against*, and *Princes* for the *Church* of *Rome*.

# AN ANSWER TO THE SECOND PAPER.

*IT is a ſad thing to conſider, what a world of Hereſies are crept into this Nation.*

But is it not a ſtrange thing to conſider, that no diſtinction is here put between the *Religion by Law eſtabliſhed*, and the Parties diſowned by it, and diſſenting from it? And yet many of theſe, though juſtly liable to the charge of *Schiſm*, embrace no Hereſies againſt the Four or Six firſt General Councils. But if the Diſſenters were guilty of never ſo many Hereſies, how comes the *Church* of *England* to bear the blame of them; when the weakning its Power and Authority was the occaſion of ſuch an overflowing of *Schiſms* and *Hereſies* among us? And it is indeed a ſad thing to conſider how many Ways and Means have been uſed by all Parties to introduce and keep up *Schiſms* and *Diviſions* amongſt us, and then how the *Church* of *England* is blamed for not being able to ſuppreſs them. But if all Doctrines oppoſite to the *Church* of *Rome* be accounted *Hereſies*, then we deſire to be informed, how the *Church* of *Rome* came to have this Power of defining Heretical Doctrines; or how any Doctrine comes to be *Hereſie* by being contrary to its definitions. For *Hereſie is an obſtinate oppoſing ſome neceſſary Article of Faith.* It muſt therefore be proved, that what the *Church* of *Rome* declares, doth thereby become a neceſſary Article of Faith, or it is very unreaſonable to lay the imputation of *Hereſie* upon us. And this can never be maintained, without proving that the *Church* of *Rome* hath a Power to make Doctrines not neceſſary before, to become neceſſary by her Definition: which is the ſame thing with making *New Articles of Faith.* But theſe can never be proved to be ſuch by Univerſal Tradition; which the *Church* of *Rome* pretends for all her Articles of Faith.

*Every Man thinks himſelf as competent a Judge of Scripture, as the very Apoſtles themſelves.*

Doth *Every Man* among us pretend to an infallible Spirit? And yet *Every Man* owns that the Apoſtles had it. But what is meant by *being a Judge of Scripture?* If no more be underſtood, than that *every Man* muſt uſe his underſtanding about it, I hope this is no Crime nor *Hereſie.* The Scripture muſt be believed in order to Salvation, and therefore it muſt be underſtood; for how can a Man believe, what he underſtands not the ſenſe or meaning of? If he muſt underſtand the

sense he must be *Judge of the sense*; so that every Man, who is bound to believe the Scripture in order to his Salvation, must be Judge of the sense of the Scripture, so far as concerns his Salvation. But if by being a *Judge of the Scripture* be meant giving such a judgment, as obliges others to submit to it, then among us no particular Man doth pretend to be a *competent Judge of Scripture*, so as to bind others to rely upon his Authority in expounding Scripture. We own the Authority of Guides in the Church, and a due submission to them, but we do not allow them to be as *competent Judges of Scripture as the very Apostles.*

*And 'tis no wonder it should be so, since that part of the Nation, which looks most like a Church, dares not bring the true Arguments against the other Sects, for fear they should be turned against themselves, and confuted by their own Arguments.*

This is directly level'd against the Church of *England*, which is hereby charged with Insincerity or Weakness in dealing with the Dissenters. But we must consider the meaning of this charge. *It is no wonder it should be so*, i. e. *That every Man should think himself as competent a Judge of Scripture, as the very Apostles, because the* Church *of* England *dares not use the true Arguments against the Sects.* Whence it appears that this true Argument is the Church's *infallible Authority*, and the Obligation of all Members of the Church to submit their judgments intirely thereto. I confess that if the Church of *England* did pretend to this against the *Sectaries*, they might justly turn it against her; because in our Articles, though the *Church's Authority* be asserted, yet *Infallibility* is denyed. If there can be no Authority in a Church, without Infallibility; or there can be no obligation to submit to Authority, without it; then the *Church* of *England* doth not use the best Arguments against Sectaries. But if there be no ground for Infallibility, if the Church which hath most pretended to it, hath been most grossly deceived; if the Heads of that Church have been not barely suspected of *Heresie*, but one of them stands condemned for it in Three General Councils, own'd by that Church; then for all that I can see, the *Church* of *England* hath wisely disown'd the pretence of Infallibility, and made use of the best Arguments against Sectaries from a just Authority, and the sinfulness and folly of the Sectaries refusing to submit to it.

*The Church of* England *(as 'tis called) would fain have it thought, That they are the Judges in matters Spiritual, yet dare not say positively, there is no Appeal from them.*

Is not the *Church* of *England* really what *it is called?* I would fain know what it wants to make it as good a *Church*, as any in the Christian World? It wants neither *Faith* (if the Creed contain it) nor *Sacraments*, (and those entire) nor *Succession* of *Bishops*, (as certain as *Rome* it self) nor a *Liturgy*, (more agreeing to Primitive Worship, than is any where else to be found.) Why then *the Church* of *England, as 'tis called?* Well! But what is this *Church* now blamed for? *They pretend to be Judges in matters Spiritual, and yet dare not say there is no appeal from them.* How then? Are there no true Judges, but such as there lies no Appeal from? There lies an Appeal from any Judges in the King's Courts to the Court of Parliament; are They not therefore true

Judges

Judges in *Westminster-Hall?* There lay an Appeal from Bishops to Metropolitans, from them to Patriarchs, from Patriarchs to General Councils, according tothe Ancient Polity of the Church. Were there therefore no true Judges, but General Councils?

What follows relating to the *Church's Authority, and every Man's following his own judgment*, hath been answered already. I proceed therefore, to what farther concerns this matter of Appeal.

*What Country can subsist in Quiet, where there is not a Supreme Judge, from whence there can be no Appeal?*

The natural consequence from hence appears to be, that every *National Church* ought to have the *Supreme Power* within it self. But how come Appeals to a foreign Jurisdiction to tend to the Peace and Quiet of a Church? They have been always complained of in the best Ages of the Church, and by the best Men; such as St. *Cyprian*, and St. *Augustine*, and the whole *African Churches*. The worst Men began them, and the worst Church encouraged them, without regard to the Peace of the Christian Church, so it increased its own Grandeur by them.

*We have had these hundred Years past, the sad effects of denying to the Church, that Power in matters Spiritual, without an Appeal.*

And our Ancestors for many hundred Years last past, found the intolerable Inconveniences of an Appeal to foreign Jurisdiction. Whereby the Nation was exhausted, Justice obstructed, the Clergy oppressed, and the King's Prerogative greatly diminished. *But these were slight things in Comparison to what we have felt these hundred Years past for want of it.*

Have not the King's Courts been opened for matters of Law and Justice, which have been fill'd with Men of as great Abilities and Integrity, since the Reformation, as ever they were before? Hath not the Appeal to the King in his High Court of *Chancery* been as much for the King and People, as ever the Appeal was to the Court of *Rome?* Have not all the Neighbour Princes been forced for the preserving their own Dignity to set Bounds and Limits to Appeals to *Rome*, and to Orders or *Bulls* that come from thence? How then comes the want of such an Appeal to be thought to produce such sad effects here? All Christendom groans under the sad effects of them; and it is a very self-denying humour for those to be most sensible of the want of them, who would really suffer the most by them.

*Can there be any Justice done, where the Offenders are their own Judges, and equal Interpreters of the Law, with those that are appointed to Administer Justice?*

And is there any likelihood, Justice should be better done in another Country, by another Authority, and proceeding by such Rules, which in the last resort, are but the Arbitrary will of a Stranger. And must such a one, pretending to a Power he hath no right to, *be Judge in his own Cause*, when he is the greatest *Offender* himself? But how is this applied to the *Protestants* in *England?*

*This*

*This is our Case, here in* England, *in matters Spiritual; for the Protestants are not of the Church of* England, *as 'tis the true Church, from whence there can be no Appeal; but because the Discipline of that Church is conformable at present to their fancies; which, as soon as it shall contradict or vary from, they are ready to embrace or join with the next Congregation of People, whose Discipline or Worship agrees with the Opinion of that Time.*

The sense of this Period is not so clear, but that one may easily mistake about it. That which is aimed at, is, that we of the *Church* of *England*, have no tie upon us, but that of our own judgments; and when that changes, we may join with *Independents* or *Presbyterians*, as we do now with the *Church* of *England*. And what security can be greater, than that of our Judgments? If it be said *to be nothing, but fancy and no true Judgment*, we must beg leave to say, that we dare Appeal to the World, whether we have not made it appear, that it is not *fancy*, but *Judgment* which hath made us firm to the *Church* of *England*. Might it not as well have been said, that *the Protestants* of the *Church* of *England, adhered to the Crown in the Times of Rebellion out of Fancy, and not out of Judgment? And that if their Fancy changed, they might as well have joined with the Rebels?* Will not this way of Reasoning hold as strongly against those of the *Church* of *Rome?* For why do any adhere to that, but because it is agreeable to their Judgment so to do? What evidence can they give, that it is *Judgment* in them, and only *Fancy* in us? If Reason must be that which puts the difference, we do not question, but to make ours appear to be *Judgment*, and theirs *Fancy?* For what is an *infallible Judge*, which Christ never appointed, but *Fancy?* What is their *unwritten Word*, as a Rule of Faith to be equally received with the Scriptures, but *Fancy?* What is giving honour to God by the *Worship of Images*, but *Fancy?* What is making *Mediators* of *Intercession*, besides the *Mediator* of *Redemption*, but *Fancy?* What is the Doctrine of *Concomitancy*, to make amends for half the Sacrament, but *Fancy?* What is the *substantial Change of the Elements in the Body of Christ*, but *Fancy?* for both Senses and Reason are against it. What is the *deliverance of Souls out of Purgatory, by Masses for the Dead*, but mere *Fancy?* But I forbear giving any more Instances.

*So that according to this Doctrine, there is no other Church nor Interpreter of Scripture, but that which lies in every Man's giddy Brain,*

Let *Mens Brains* be as *giddy*, as they are said to be, for all that I can see, they are the best faculties they can make use of, for the understanding of Scripture, or any thing else. And is there any Infallible Church upon Earth, which must not be beholding to Mens *giddy Brains* for believing it? And it may be, never the less *giddy* for doing it? For God-sake why do any Men take the *Church* of *Rome* to be *Infallible?* Is it not, because their Understandings tell them they ought so to do? So that by this consequence, there is no *Infallible Church*, but *what lies in every Man's giddy Brain.*

*I desire to know therefore of every serious Considerer of these things, whether the great Work of our Salvation ought to depend on such a Sandy Foundation as this?*

I thank

I thank God I have seriously considered this matter, and must declare that I find no Christian Church built on a more *sandy Foundation*, than that, which pretends to be setled *upon a Rock*; I mean, so far as it imposes the *new Faith of Trent*, as a necessary Condition of Salvation. Had we no other reason to embrace Christianity, than such as they offer for these New Doctrines, I am much afraid Christianity it self, to all inquisitive Men, would be thought to have but a *Sandy Foundation*. But what is this *Sandy Foundation* we build upon? Every Man's private judgment in Religion? No understanding Man builds upon his own Judgment, but no Man of understanding can believe without it. For I appeal to any *ingenious Man*, whether he doth not as much build upon his own Judgment, who chuseth the *Church*, as he that chuseth *Scripture* for his Rule? And he that chuseth the *Church*, hath many more Difficulties to conquer than the other hath. For the *Church* can never be a Rule without the *Scriptures*, but the *Scriptures* may without the *Church*. And it is no such easy matter to find the *Church's Infallibility* in the *Scripture*. But suppose that be found, he hath yet a harder *Point* to get over, *viz.* How the Promises relating to the Church in general, came to be appropriated to the *Church of Rome*. Which a Man must have an admirable Faculty at discerning, who can find it out, either in Scripture, or the *Records* of the *Ancient Church*.

The places of Scripture which are brought about *Christ's being with his Church to the end of the World*, about *the Power to forgive Sins*; about the Clergy being *God's Labourers*, *Husbandry*, *Building*, *having the Mind of Christ*; do as effectually prove the *Infallibility* of the Church of *England*, as the Church of *Rome*; for I cannot discern the least inclination in any of them to favour one against the other.

*And pray consider on the other side, that those who resist the Truth, and will not submit to his Church, draw their Arguments from Implications, and far-fetch'd Interpretations, at the same time that they deny plain and positive Words: which is so great a Disingenuity, that 'tis not almost to be thought that they can believe themselves.*

This is a very heavy Charge; *To resist the Truth, to deny plain and positive Words of Scripture; to be guilty of great Disingenuity, so as not to believe our selves*, are faults of so high a nature, as must argue not only a bad Cause, but a very bad Mind. And *God forbid*, that those of the Church of *England*, should ever be found guilty of these things. But to come to Particulars; *Is it resisting Truth, or arguing from Implications, and denying plain and positive Words of Scripture*, to say, *We must not worship Images*; *We must make God alone the Object of Holy Worship*; We must give the Eucharist in both kinds according to *Christ's express Institution*; We must understand our Prayers, when St. *Paul*'s words are so clear about it? So far at least we have *plain* and *positive Words* of *Scripture* on our side. And for *Implications, and far-fetch'd Interpretations*, commend me to the *Pope's Bulls*, especially when they have a mind to prove their Authority from Scripture; which they can do from *In the beginning*, to the end of the *Apocalypse*. But that which seems to be aimed at here, is, *This is my Body*; wherein the words seem to be *plain and positive* on their side, and our sense to be *from Implications, or far-fetched Interpretations*. To which I Answer, That there are Expressions in Scripture as *plain* and *positive* as this, which none

none think themselves bound to understand in their literal sense. For then we must all believe, that God hath *Eyes* and *Ears*, a *Face*, *Hands* and *Feet*, as firmly, as that the Bread was then turned into Christ's Body, when he spake those words. And I would know, whether the Christian Church rejecting the Doctrine of Those *who made God to be like to Man*, was not chargeable with the same *resisting the Truth*, and *denying plain and positive Words of Scripture*, as we are? And yet I hope the Christian Church *did then believe it self*. Suppose any should assert, That *the Rock in the Wilderness*, *was really changed into Christ's Body*; would not he have the very same Things to say against those who denied it? For are not the Words *as plain and as positive*, That Rock was Christ? But *Sacramental Expressions*, by the consent of the *Christian Church*, and the very Nature of the Things, are of a different sense from Logical Propositions. And if this had been intended in the plain and literal sense, St. *Paul* would never have as plainly and positively called it *Bread* after Consecration; nor the *Cup* be said to be the New Testament in his Blood.

The CONCLUSION is:

*Is there any other Foundation of the Protestant Church, but that if the Civil Magistrate pleases, he may call such of the Clergy as he thinks fit for his turn at that time, and turn the Church either to Presbytery, or Independency, or indeed what he pleases? This was the way of our pretended Reformation here in* England. *And by the same Rule and Authority, it may be altered into as many Shapes and Forms as there are Fancies in Mens Heads.*

This looks like a very unkind Requital to the Church of *England*, for her Zeal in asserting the Magistrate's Power against a Foreign Jurisdiction; to infer from thence, that the Magistrate may change the Religion here which way he pleases. But although we attribute the *Supream Jurisdiction* to the King; yet we do not question, but there are *inviolable Rights of the Church*, which ought to be preserved against the *Fancies* of some, and the *Usurpations* of others. We do by no means make our Religion mutable, according to the Magistrate's pleasure. For the Rule of our Religion is unalterable, being the *Holy Scripture*; but the Exercise of it, is under the regulation of the Laws of the Land. And as we have cause to be thankful to God, when *Kings are Nursing Fathers to our Church*; so we shall never cease to pray for their continuing so; and that in all things we may behave our selves towards them, as becomes *good Christians*, and *Loyal Subjects*.

# AN ANSWER TO THE *THIRD PAPER.*

THE Third Paper is said to be written by a Great Lady, *for the satisfaction of her Friends*, as to the Reasons of *Her leaving the Communion of the Church of* England, *and making her self a Member of the Roman Catholick Church.* If she had written nothing concerning it, none could have been a competent Judge of those Reasons or Motives she had for it, but her self: but since she was pleased *to write this Paper to satisfy her Friends*; and it is thought fit to be published for general Satisfaction, all Readers have a right to judge of the strength of them; and those of the *Church of England*, an Obligation to vindicate the Honour of it, so far as it may be thought to suffer by them.

I am sensible how nice and tender a thing it is, to meddle in a Matter wherein the Memory of so *Great a Lady* is so nearly concern'd; and wherein such Circumstances are mention'd, which cannot fully be cleared, the Parties themselves having been many Years dead: But I shall endeavour to keep within due bounds, and consider this Paper with respect to the main Design of it, and take notice of other Particulars so far as they are subservient to it.

The way of her *Satisfaction* must needs appear very extraordinary; for towards the Conclusion she confesses, *She was not able, nor would she enter into Disputes with any Body.* Now where the Difference between the two Churches lies wholly in Matters of Dispute, how any one could be truly satisfied, as to the Grounds of leaving one Church, and going to the other, without *entring into matter of Dispute with any body*, is hard to understand. If Persons be resolved before-hand what to do, and therefore will hear nothing said against it, there is no such way, as to declare they will *enter into no Dispute about it.* But what *Satisfaction* is to be had in this manner of proceeding? How could *one bred up in the Church of* England, *and so well instructed in the Doctrines of it*, ever satisfy her self in forsaking the Communion of it, without enquiring into, and comparing the Doctrines and Practices of both Churches? It is possible for Persons of Learning, who will take the pains of examining things themselves, to do that, without *entring into Disputes with any Body*: but this was not to be presumed of a Person of her Condition. For many things must fall in her way, which she could neither have the leisure to examine, nor the Capacity to judge of, without the Assist-

ance of such who have made it their business to search into them. Had she no Divines of the Church of *England* about her, to have proposed her Scruples to? None able and willing to give her their utmost Assistance in a Matter of such Importance, before she took up a Resolution of forsaking our Church? This cannot be imagined; considering not only her great Quality, but that just esteem they had for her whilst she continued so zealous and devout in the Communion of our Church.

But we have more than this to say. One of the * Bishops who had the nearest Relation to her for many Years, and who owns in Print, * *That he bred her up in the Principles of the Church of* England, was both able and willing to have removed any Doubts and Scruples with respect to our Church, if she would have been pleased to have communicated them to him. And however she endeavoured to conceal her Scruples; he tells her, in his † Letter to her (which he since printed for his own vindication) *That he had heard much Discourse concerning her wavering in Religion, and that he had acquainted her Highness with it, the Lent before the Date of this Paper*; and was so much concerned at it, that he obtained a Promise from her, That if any Writing were put into her Hands by those of the Church of *Rome*, that she would send it either to him, or to the then Bishop of *Oxford*, whom he left in Attendance upon her. After which, he saith, *She was many Days with him at* Farnham; *in all which time she spake not one word to him of any Doubt she had about her Religion.* And yet this Paper bears Date, *Aug.* 20. that Year, wherein she declares her self changed in her Religion: So that it is evident she did not make use of the ordinary Means for her own Satisfaction, at least as to those Bishops who had known her longest.

* *Preface to his Treatise.* p. 5.

† *Letter to her Royal Highness from the Bishop of* Winton. p. 3, 4.

Blandford. Pag. 14.

But she saith, *That she spake severally to two of the best Bishops we have in* England, *who both told her, there were many things in the Roman Church, which it were much to be wished we had kept; As Confession, which was no doubt commanded of God; that Praying for the Dead, was one of the Ancient Things in Christianity; that for their parts they did it daily, though they would not own it. And afterwards pressing one of them very much upon the other Points; he told her, That if he had been bred a Catholick, he would not change his Religion; but that being of another Church, wherein he was sure were all things necessary to Salvation, he thought it very ill to give that Scandal, as to leave that Church wherein he received his Baptism. Which Discourses,* she said, *did but add more to the desire she had to be a Catholick.*

Sheldon *Archbishop of* Canterbury. Blanford *Bishop of* Worcester. Blandford *Bishop of* Worcester.

This, I confess, seems to be to the purpose; if there were not some Circumstances and Expressions very much mistaken in the Representation of it: But yet suppose the utmost to be allow'd, there could be no Argument from hence drawn for leaving the Communion of our Church, if this Bishop's *Authority* or *Example* did signify any thing with her. For supposing he did say, *That if he had been bred in the Communion of the Church of* Rome, *he would not change his Religion:* Yet he added, *That being of another Church, wherein were all things necessary to Salvation, he thought it very ill to give that Scandal, as to leave that Church wherein he had received his Baptism.*

*tism.* Now why should not the last words have greater force to have kept her in the Communion of our Church, than the former to have drawn her from it? For why should any Person forsake the Communion of our Church, unless it appears necessary to Salvation so to do? And yet this yielding Bishop did affirm, *that all things necessary to Salvation were certainly in our Church; and that it was an ill thing to leave it.* How could this *add to her desire of leaving our Church?* unless there were some other Motive to draw her thither, and then such small Inducements would serve to inflame such a Desire. But it is evident from her own words afterwards, that these Concessions of the Bishop could have no Influence upon her: for she declares, *and calls God to witness, that she would never have changed her Religion, if she had thought it possible to save her Soul otherwise.* Now what could the Bishop's words signify towards her Turning, when he declares just contrary, *viz.* not only that it was possible for her to be saved without turning, *but that he was sure we had all things necessary to Salvation; and that it was a very ill thing to leave our Church?* There must therefore have been some more secret Reason, which *encreased her Desire to be a Catholick after these Discourses:* unless the Advantage were taken from the Bishop's calling *the Church of* Rome *the Catholick Religion; If he had been bred a Catholick, he would not have chang'd his Religion.* But if we take these words so strictly, he must have contradicted himself; for how could he *be sure we had all things necessary to Salvation,* if we were out of the Catholick Church? Was a Bishop of our Church, and *one of the best Bishops of our Church,* as she said, so weak as to yield, *That he was sure all things necessary to Salvation were to be had out of the Communion of the Catholick Church?*

But again; there is an inconsistency in his saying, *That he thought it very ill to leave our Church;* which no Man of common sense would have said, if he had believed the *Roman Church* to be the *Catholick,* exclusive of all others that do not join in Communion with it.

The utmost then that can be made of all this, is, That there was a certain Bishop of this Church, who held *both Churches* to be so far *Parts* of the *Catholick Church,* that there was no necessity of going from one Church to another. But if he asserted that, he must overthrow the *necessity* of the *Reformation,* and consequently not believe our *Articles* and *Homilies,* and so could not be any true Member of the *Church* of *England.*

But the late Bishop of *Winchester* hath made a shorter Answer to all this; For he first doubts, *Whether there ever were any such Bishops who made such Answers;* And afterwards he affirms, *That he believes there never was,* in Rerum Naturâ, *such a Discourse as is pretended to have been between this Great Person, and two of the most Learned Bishops of* England. But, God be thanked, the Cause of our Church doth not depend upon the singular Opinion of one or two Bishops in it, wherein they apparently recede from the establish'd Doctrine of it. And I am sure those of the *Church* of *Rome* take it ill from us, to be charged with the Opinion of Particular Divines, against the known Sentiments of their Church. Therefore supposing the Matter of Fact true, it ought not

*Pref.* p. 2. p. 4.

not to have moved her to any Inclination to leave the *Church* of *England.*

But after all, *She protests, in the Presence of Almighty God, that no Person, Man or Woman, directly or indirectly, ever said any thing to her (since she came into* England) *or used the least Endeavour to make her change her Religion; and that it is a Blessing she wholly owes to Almighty God.* So that the Bishops are acquitted from having any hand in it, by her own words; and as far as we can understand her meaning, she thought her self converted by immediate Divine Illumination. We had thought the pretence to a *private Spirit* had not been at this time allow'd in the Church of *Rome.* But I observe, that many things are allowed to bring Persons to the Church of *Rome,* which they will not permit in those who go from it. As the use of Reason in the Choice of a Church; the Judgment of Sense; and here, that which they would severely condemn in others as a Private Spirit, or *Enthusiasm,* will pass well enough if it doth but lead one to their Communion. Any Motive or Method is good enough which tends to that end; and none can be sufficient against it. But why may not others set up for the Change as to other Opinions upon the same Grounds, as well as this Great Person does, as to the Change from our Church to the Church of *Rome?* And we have no Pretenders to *Enthusiasm* among us, but do as solemnly ascribe *the Blessing wholly to Almighty God*; and look on it as the Effect of such *Prayers* as she made to him in *France* and *Flanders.*

But I wonder a Person, *who owed her Change so wholly to Almighty God,* should need the Direction of an Infallible Church; since the utmost they can pretend to, is no more than to have such an Immediate Conduct; and the least that can be meant by it, is, that she had no Assistance from any other Persons. Which may not exclude her own *Endeavours:* but supposing them to be employed, and an Account to be here given of them; yet there is no Connexion between any of the *Premisses,* and the *Conclusion* she drew from them; and therefore it must be Immediate Impulse, or some concealed Motive which determin'd her Choice.

The *Conclusion* was, That *she would never have changed, if she could have saved her Soul otherwise.* If this were true, she had good Reason for her Change; if it were not true, she had none; as it is most certain it was not, Now let us examine how she came to this *Conclusion*; and I will suppose it to have been just in the Method she sets it down in.

First, she saith, *She never had any Scruples till the* November *before; and then they began upon reading* Dr. Heylin's *History of the Reformation; which was commended to her as a Book to settle her; and there she found such abominable Sacrilege upon* Henry *the* 8th's *Divorce, King* Edward's *Minority, and Queen* Elizabeth's *Succession, that she could not believe the Holy Ghost could ever be in such Counsels.*

This was none of the best Advices given to such a Person, to read Dr. *Heylin*'s History for her Satisfaction. For there are two distinct Parts in the *History* of our *Reformation*; the one *Ecclesiastical,* the other

ther *Political:* the former was built on Scripture and Antiquity, and the Rights of particular Churches; the other on such Maxims which are common to State-men at all Times, and in all Churches, who labour to turn all Revolutions and Changes to their own Advantage. And it is strange to me that a Person of so great Understanding, should not distinguish these two. *Whether* Henry 8. *were a good Man or not*; *Whether the Duke of* Somerset *raised his Estate of out Church Lands*, doth not concern our present Enquiry; which is, Whether there was not sufficient Cause for a Reformation in the Church? And if there was, Whether our Church had not sufficient Authority to reform it self? And if so, Whether the Proceedings of our Reformation were not Justifiable by the Rules of Scripture and the ancient Church? These were the proper Points for her to have considered, and not the particular Faults of Princes, or the Miscarriages of Ministers of State. Were not the Vices of *Alexander* the 6th, and many other Heads of the Church of *Rome* for a whole Age together, by the Confession of their own greatest Writers, as great at least as those of *Henry* the 8th? And were these not thought sufficient to keep her from the *Church* of *Rome*; and yet the others were sufficient to make her think of leaving our Church? But *Henry* the *Eighth*'s *Church* was in Truth the *Church* of *Rome* under *a Political Head*, much as the *Church* of *Sicily* is under the *King* of *Spain*. All the difference is, *Henry* the *Eighth* took it as his own Right; the *King* of *Spain* pretends to have it from the Pope, by such Concessions, which the Popes deny. And suppose the King of *Spain*'s Pretence were unlawful to that Jurisdiction which he challengeth in the Kingdom of *Sicily*; were this a sufficient Ground to justify the thoughts of Separation from the Church of *Rome?*

*But the Duke of* Somerset *raised his Estate out of Church-Lands, and so did many Courtiers in the Reign of Queen* Elizabeth.

Are there not Miscarriages of the like nature in the Church of *Rome?* What is the *Pope's making great Estates of the Church-Lands*, for their Nephews to be Princes and Dukes? a thing not unheard of in our Age. And is it not so much worse to be done by the Head of the Church?

These she confesses *were* but *Scruples*; but such as occasioned *her examining the Points in difference by the Holy Scripture.* Now she was in the right way for Satisfaction, provided she made use of the best Helps and Means for understanding it; *and took in the Assistance of her Spiritual Guides.* But it seems, contrary to the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome, she found some things so easy there, that she wondred she had been so long without finding them out.* And what were these? No less than *the Real Presence in the Blessed Sacrament*; *the Infallibility of the Church, Confession, and Praying for the Dead.*

These were great Discoveries to be made *so easily*, considering how those of the Church of *Rome*, who have been most vers'd in these Matters, have found it so difficult to make them out from thence.

(1.) As to the *Real Presence*; as it is in the Dispute between us and the Church of *Rome*, it implies the Real and Substantial Change of the Elements

Elements into the Body and Blood of Christ. But where do our Saviour's words, in *calling the Sacrament his Body and Blood*, imply any such thing? The wisest Persons of the Church of *Rome* have confessed, that the bare words of our Saviour can never prove it; but there needs the Authority of the Church to interpret them in that sense. How then could she so easily find out that, which their most Learned Men could not? But there is nothing goes so far in such Discoveries as a willing Mind.

(2.) As to *Confession*. No doubt the Word is often used in Scripture, and therefore *easily found*. But the Question between us, is not about the Usefulness or Advantage of *Confession* in particular Cases, but the Necessity of it in all Cases, in order to Remission of Sins. And I can hardly believe any Bishop of our Church would ever say to her, *that Confession* in this sense *was ever commanded by God*. For then he must be damned himself if he did not confess every known Sin to a Priest. But some general Expressions might be used, that Confession of Sin was commanded by God; *Confess your Sins one to another:* But here is nothing of a particular Confession to a Priest, necessary in order to Forgiveness of Sin.

(3.) As *to praying for the Dead*; It is hard to find any place of Scripture which seems to have any tendency that way, unless it be with respect to the *Day of Judgment*, and that very doubtfully. But how came this Great Person to think it not possible to be saved in our Church, unless we prayed for the Dead? How did this come to be a Point of Salvation? And for the *Practice* of it, she saith, *the Bishops told her they did it daily*. Whether they did it or not, or in what sense they did it, we cannot now be better informed: But we are sure this could be no Argument for her to leave the Communion of our Church, because she was told by these Bishops they did it, and continued in the Communion of it,

(4.) Lastly; As to *the Infallibility of the Church*. If this, as applied to the *Roman Church*, could be any where found in Scripture, we should then indeed be to blame not to submit to all the Definitions of it. But where is this to be found? Yes, *Christ hath promised to be with his Church to the end of the World*. Not with his *Church*, but with his *Apostles:* And if it be restrained to them, then *the end of the World* is no more than *always*. But suppose it to be understood of the Successors of the Apostles; were there none but at *Rome?* How comes this Promise to be limited to the Church of *Rome*; and the Bishops of *Antioch* and *Alexandria*, and all the other Eastern Churches (where the Bishops as certainly succeeded the Apostles, as at *Rome* it self) not to enjoy the equal Benefit of this Promise? But they who can find the *Infallibility of the Church of* Rome in Scripture, need not despair of finding whatever they have a Mind to there.

But from this Promise she concludes, *That our Saviour would not permit the Church to give the Laity the Communion in One kind, if it were not lawful so to do*. Now in my Opinion, the Argument is stronger the other way; The Church of *Rome* forbids the doing of that, which Christ

Christ enjoyned; therefore it cannot be Infallible, since the Command of Christ is so much plainer than the Promise of Infalliblity to the Church of *Rome*.

But, from all these things laid together, I can see no imaginable Reason of any force to conclude, that *she could not think it possible to save her Soul otherwise*, than by embracing the Communion of the Church of *Rome*. And the Publick will receive this Advantage by these Papers, that thereby it appears, how very little is to be said by Persons of the greatest Capacity, as well as Place, either against the Church of *England*, or for the Church of *Rome*.

A VIN-

# A VINDICATION OF THE ANSWER TO SOME Late Papers

## Concerning the UNITY and AUTHORITY of the *Catholick Church*, and the Reformation of the *Church* of *England*.

IT was so tempting a Piece of Honour, to appear *as the Champion of the Royal Papers*, that I rather wonder that no more, than these, have shewed themselves to the World, under so inviting a *Character*. Which seems to have betray'd them into more than usual Security; presuming, I suppose, that they are to be looked on, as a sort of *Heralds* in *Controversie*, whose bearing the *Royal Arms*, will keep them from being touched themselves, though they bid Defiance to others. But where Truth lies at stake, every one hath a Right to put in for it; and whose Game soever any Person plays, those ought to carry it who have the best Cards to shew: I mean, that in Debates of this Nature and Consequence, other Considerations ought to be so far laid aside, that the strongest Reason should prevail. But lest I be again thought *to have a mind to flourish before I offer to pass*; as the *Champion* speaks in his proper Language; I shall apply my self to the Matter before us. Only taking Notice that I am now glad to enter the Lists upon even Ground. For although I thought I behaved my self with due Respect and Decency before, yet I perceive the Measure of those Things is so Nice and Arbitrary, that it is very hard to escape Censures, where the Distance is so great. But those who live in the Country may mean and intend as well to their Prince, as those who live at Court, though they do not make so fine Legs, nor are of so pleasing an Address.

*Def.* p. 1.

Pag. 1.

The plain Truth is; Controvetsie is quite another thing from Courtship and Poetry. It is like a Trial at Law, which ought to depend on Evidence and Proof, though the King himself be concerned in it. And as we must *give Honour to whom Honour*, so Truth to whom Truth *is due*: and this without Respect of Persons; it being a Case long since decided, That *Truth is greater than the King*.

If I thought there were no such Thing in the World as true Religion, and that *the Priests of all Religions are alike*, I might have been as nimble a Convert, and as early a Defender of the Royal Papers, as any one of these Champions. For why should not one who believes no Religion, de-

clare for any? But since I do verily believe not only that there is such a Thing as true Religion, but that it is only to be found in the Books of Holy Scripture, I have Reason to enquire after the best Means of understanding the Sense of those Books, and thereby, if it may be, to put an end to the Controversies of *Christendom*.

This was the noble Design of the two Royal Papers; which are written with far greater Strength, and Spirit, and Closeness, than these which are published in Defence of them. But notwithstanding all their fair Appearance, I could not be convinced by the Reason contained in them, (and much less by the Defence of them) which I endeavour'd to represent as far as I could judge, with Modesty and Civility. But if I have offended in any thing against the strict Rules of good Manners, I hope I may be the more easily forgiven, since their Casuists allow involuntary Faults to be in their own Nature venial.

The Method proposed by the Paper for ending Controversies, was by finding out a Principle for doing it, *as visible as that the Scripture is in Print*. This I could not but extreamly approve, as a very satisfactory Method of proceeding; and the Consequence I said would be, that all Men of Sense would soon give over disputing; for none who dare to believe what they see, can call that in Question.

Pag. 2. The Author of the *Reply* saith, *I mistook the Meaning of the Words*, which he saith was this, *That whatever Motives render it visible that a Book in Print is Scripture*, i. e. *the Word of God, the same or other Motives are as powerful to render this other Truth as visible, that none can be that Church, but that which is called the* Roman-Catholick *Church*.

Def. p. 2, 3. The Defender saith, *The Church is more visible than Scripture, because the Scripture is seen by the Church; for which he brings S.* Augustin's *Authority. And if by saying that the Scripture is in Print, be understood a thing out of Question; then he denies it to be visible that the Scripture is in Print; because many Men do call Scripture in question at this Day; and to question whether the Book in print be Scripture, is manifestly to question whether Scripture be in print.*

The Words of the Royal Paper are plain, but these Interpretations of them so forced and unnatural, that there needs no other Confutation of them, but to compare their confused Comment with the Text. *It is as visible, as that the Scripture is in Print*; that is, it is a Thing evident to Sense; for so it is that *the Book called the Scripture or the Bible is in print*. Now what is it which is affirmed in the Paper to be thus evident? *viz. this Proposition, That none can be that one Church which Christ has here on Earth, but that which is called the Roman Catholick Church*. But if it be certain (as I doubt not to make it appear) that what is called *the Roman Catholick Church* is but a Part of that *One Church which Christ has here on Earth*, then the plain result of this Proposition must be, that it is a Thing evident to Sense that *a Part is the Whole*. Now this looked so oddly, that these Gentlemen were resolved that this should not be the Sense of the plain Words; and therefore have endeavoured to put another Sense, (if it may be called so) upon them. And if their Church can but interpret Scripture at this Rate, we are in a hopeful way to have a speedy and happy end of Controversies.

As to the Consequence I drew from hence, that if Controversies could be determined by a Principle as visible as that Scripture is in Print, all Men of Sense would soon give over disputing, for none who dare believe what they see would call that in question; One saith, *The sooner the better*.

So

So say I too, upon good Grounds. But what would then become of *the Noble Science of Controverſie.* The other ſaith, *That Catholicks and Proteſtants are both Men of Senſe, and yet they diſpute about the Scripture which is in Print.* And what then? This is to ſhew that *the Scriptures being in Print* is one thing, and the Authority of the Scripture is another. The one is a common Object of Senſe, in which all are agreed; the other is liable to many Diſputes, and therefore could not be meant in the Papers. Def. p. 2. Rep. p. 2.

But they have a notable Cavil againſt Mens *believing what they ſee*, becauſe *Faith is of things not ſeen.* This Cavil had been as good againſt our Bleſſed Saviour, when he ſaid to *Thomas, becauſe thou haſt ſeen, thou haſt believed.* I hope upon ſecond Thoughts, they will not tell him, that this was improperly ſpoken, and not like a Schoolman. Call it what you will, the ſingle Queſtion is, Whether your Church will allow us to judge of things according to the plain Evidence of Senſe? One ſaith, *It is impoſſible that any Man ſhould be commanded not to believe what he ſees. Believing* here is the *Judgment* of the Mind upon the Repreſentation of Senſe; and will he ſecure us that the Church can never require us to judge otherwiſe than according to the Evidence of Senſe? I wiſh he would make his Words good, for I aſſure him he would remove a terrible Block out of our way. My Senſes plainly tell me, what I ſee and feel and taſte is as much Bread after Conſecration as it was before; how then comes it to paſs that my Judgment that it was Bread before, was very good; but although there be the very ſame Evidence afterwards, without the leaſt Alteration to Senſe, yet then I am to judge juſt contrary, *i. e.* that it is not Bread, which I ſee and feel and taſte juſt as I did before? Def. p. 3. Rep. p. 3. Rep. p. 3.

But he ſaith, *what is ſeen is only the Form, Shape and Figure of Bread and Wine, and that they believe to be there.* But alas! This doth not reach to the Point. For the Queſtion is not about external Appearances, but about the Judgment of the Mind upon the Evidence of Senſe. I will make this Matter plainer, that they may know where the Difficulty lies. When Chriſt's Body appeared to the Diſciples after his Reſurrection, there was no Diſpute among them concerning *the Form, Shape and Figure of his Body*, but the Doubt was, whether from theſe they were to conclude that it was Chriſt's real Body or not? If not, they could not believe from the Evidence of Senſe that Chriſt's Body was riſen from the dead; if they were, let them tell us how Chriſt's Body comes to be ſo much changed and to loſe thoſe Eſſential Properties of a Body which it once had and was judged by; and farther, what Ground there is for us now not to allow that Judgment of Senſe which Chriſt himſelf appealed to, after the Inſtitution of the Sacrament? For if Chriſt had therein declared that our Senſes are not to be our Rule of judging concerning his Body; he would certainly not have appealed ſo ſoon after to the Senſes of his Diſciples concerning that very Body; and neither he nor his Diſciples have given the leaſt Intimation, that what we ſee and feel to be one Body, we muſt believe to be quite another which we can neither ſee nor feel.

*Did not two Angels appear to* Lot *in the Figure and Shapes of Men; and the Holy Ghoſt deſcend in the form of a Dove? and were they who ſaw them, to believe according to the Evidence of Senſe?* I anſwer, that there is a great deal of Difference to be made between Inviſible Powers appearing under bodily Shapes, and a natural, viſible, palpable extended Body loſing the Properties of a Body and becoming inviſible, impalpable and indiviſible; And withal there is a great difference, between Spiritual Powers uniting the real Particles of Matter into a Body, and the making the Form,

Figure, and Shape of a real Body to be where there is no Substance of a Body. We do not pretend to judge by our Senses of Invisible Substances under outward Appearances; but of the Truth of a bodily Substance by all the Appearances of a Body, under all the Circumstances necessary for the right Judgment of Sense.

Def. p. 3, 4. The other saith, *he knows of no Church which allows not People to believe all they see.* May we then believe that to be still Bread which we see to be so? No, he saith, *the What of a thing is not the Object of Sense.* I perceive then our Senses are very impertinent things; and only give an Account of the Circumstances and not of the Substances of things. But I pray did not the Disciples perceive the *What* of Christ's Body by their Senses? How do we know the *What* of any bodily Substance but by them? It is meer Collusion to say *our Senses do not judge of Substances*; for our bare Senses judge of nothing, but are the means of conveying the Impressions or Representations inward, whereby our Minds do pass Judgment upon things. And either we cannot know the Substance of any thing sensible, or we must know the *What of it* (as he speaks,) by our Senses.

We now come to the main Business; which for the clearer Proceeding I shall put under three distinct Heads.

I. Concerning the Unity of the Catholick Church.
II. Concerning the Authority of it.
III. Concerning the Reformation of the Church of *England.*

## I. *Of the Unity of the Catholick Church.*

AND here the Point to be discussed, is, *viz. Whether that which is called the Roman Catholick Church, be that one Church which Christ has here on Earth?*

(1.) The first thing I objected against it was, that a Part cannot be the Whole; but that which is called the Roman Catholick Church is but a Part; and therefore it cannot be the One Catholick Church of Christ here on Earth.

Here, to prevent Cavilling, I must declare that I meant not the *Roman Diocese* or *Province*, but *all the Churches which live in Communion with and Subjection to the Bishop of* Rome *as Head of the Church; and look on it as necessary to Salvation so to do.* And this I still assert to be but a Part of the Catholick Church and a corrupt one too.

Pag. 5. The Author of the *Defence* saith, *All this Riddle of Part and Whole comes from my Inadvertence.* How so? *Because I confound the Roman Diocese with the Roman Catholick Church.* No, I assure him I did take it in their own Sense, *for all that embrace the Matters of Faith* which are received in *the Roman Communion.* And He need not fear my doing otherwise; for I intend to discourse of no other Church but this; and this I deny, as so taken, to be the *One Catholick Church. Doth not Catholick signifie all the Parts?* I am sure it ought to do so; but I say it doth not, when *Roman* is joyned to *Catholick*; for then it excludes all those from being Parts of the *Catholick Church*, which do not joyn in the *Roman Communion*; and this I say is unreasonable. And here I expected some Proof in so material a Point; but there is not a Word farther, than that *Catholick comprehends all*; but I say again, *Roman Catholick* excludes all that are not in its Communion. As suppose any one should say *the* German *Ocean is the whole Sea*; and to prove it, should reason as this Gentleman doth; *Ocean*

*is*

*is the whole Sea, is it not? And is it the leſs the Ocean, becauſe* German *is added to it?* No, the Ocean is juſt as large as ever it was; but the adding *German* to it reſtrains the Senſe of *Ocean* to it within certain Bounds; and excludes many parts of the great Ocean, which are without thoſe Limits. Juſt ſo it is in adding *Roman* to *Catholick*; *Catholick* alone comprehends all the Parts of the Church, but *Roman* added to it confines the Senſe of it to thoſe who embrace the Faith received in the *Roman Communion*; and this excludes all other Parts of the *Catholick Church*; and ſo makes a Part to be the Whole.

(2.) I objected farther, that if this had been the Catholick Church meant in the Creeds, this Limitation ought to have been expreſſed in the Creeds, and put to Perſons to be baptized; which being never done in the Roman Church it ſelf, I thence inferr'd that it did not believe it ſelf to be the One Catholick Church, which we profeſs to believe in the Creeds.

Here the Author of the *Reply* anſwers, *That Catholick and Roman Catholick were in the Language of Antiquity one and the ſame thing; and this Point being never called in Queſtion in the time when the Creeds were publiſhed, there was no occaſion to put Roman into the Creeds; no more than of putting in Conſubſtantial with the Father till it was denied.* Pag. 5.

This were a ſubſtantial way of anſwering the Difficulty, if it would in any meaſure hold. But I ſhall now prove juſt the Contrary to have been the Senſe of Antiquity by plain and undeniable Inſtances in Matters of Fact, in moſt of the Ages of the Chriſtian Church; from the very next to the Apoſtolical, down to the Council of *Trent*. To which I ſhall only premiſe this, which I think no *Roman Catholick* will deny me, *viz.* that the *Roman Catholick Church doth imply Obedience to the Biſhop of* Rome *as Supream viſible Head of the Church under Chriſt.* For *Bellarmine* and others, *make not only Faith and Sacraments neceſſary to the Being of the Church, but Submiſſion to lawful Paſtors, and eſpecially to the Pope as Chriſt's only Vicar upon Earth; and he placeth the* Eſſential Unity *of the Catholick Church in the Conjunction of the Members, under Chriſt and his Vicar, as Head of the Church.* And from hence he excludes *Schiſmaticks out of the Catholick Church, though they have Unity of Faith and Sacraments and Hope and Spirit.* And the *Roman Catechiſm* makes *Union with the Pope as viſible Head of the Church neceſſary to the Unity of the Catholick Church.* *De Eccleſ. l. 3. c. 2.* *Ibid. c. 5.* *Catech. Rom. Part. 1. c. 10. n. 10.*

And the Proofs I bring ſhall not be from ſhort or doubtful Sentences, but from remarkable Paſſages and notorious Acts of the Church.

In the Firſt Age of the Church the Name *Catholick* was as little known, as the *Authority* of the *Roman Church*; it not being once found in the Apoſtolical Writings; for the Inſcriptions of the *Catholick Epiſtles* are of latter times. And if they were allowed to be Apoſtolical, they would be far from proving any thing to this Purpoſe, ſince the *Roman Church* is never mentioned in theſe Epiſtles, unleſs under the Name of *Babylon*; and I ſuppoſe they would not like the Title of the *Catholick Babyloniſh Church*. But in all the Directions of the Apoſtles concerning Unity of Faith, there is not one which gives the leaſt Intimation, that the *Roman Church* in any Senſe was to be the Rule or Standard of Faith or Communion.

In the Second Age we find Two remarkable Inſtances that the Communion of the *Catholick Church* was not to be taken from *Conjunction with the Biſhop of* Rome *as Head of it.*

The Firſt is from the *Biſhop of Rome*'s approving *the Prophecies of Montanus, Priſca* and *Maximilla*. This would hardly appear credible if *Tertullian*

*Tertul. c. Praxeam c. 1.*

*tullian* had not expresly affirmed it; and he farther saith, *That had it not been for* Praxeas *a Heretick, he had taken them into the Communion of the Catholick Church; and he prevailed with him to revoke his communicatory Letters already past.* What a Case had the *Catholick Church* been in at this time, if the *Bishop* of *Rome* had been look'd on as the *Centre of Catholick Communion*, and if he had not been better informed by *Praxeas a Heretick?*

The Second in the same Age is when *Victor* took upon him to excommunicate the Eastern Bishops for not celebrating *Easter* at the same time they did at *Rome*. If now the Eastern Bishops did own the *Roman-Catholick* and *Catholick Church* to be the same, they must shew it at such a time by their regard to the Pope's Sentence as *Head of the Catholick Church*: But they owned no such Authority he had over them; and instead of it *Polycrates* Bishop of *Ephesus*, with a Council of Bishops joyning with him about *A. D.* 197, wrote a smart Epistle to *Victor*, wherein they let him know *they would go on in their way, notwithstanding his threats, and that it was better to obey God than Man.* From whence it is observable, That they followed their own judgment against the Pope's; and that they believed the Pope required things of them so contrary to the Will of God, that they resolved to disobey him. And his requiring their Compliance was no Argument of his *Authority*, but of his *Usurpation.*

*Nota Collect. Concil. Baluz. p. 10.*

In the Third Age happen'd a famous Contest between *Stephen* Bishop of *Rome*, and the *Eastern* and *African Bishops*, about *Re-baptizing Hereticks.* I meddle not now with the Controversie it self, but with the Sense of those Bishops upon occasion of it as to the *Roman-Catholick Church.* The Bishop of *Rome* did at least threaten to Excommunicate the *African* Bishops. And if *Firmilian* may be believed, *he did actually Excommunicate the* Asian *Bishops.* How did these Primitive Bishops behave themselves under this Sentence? They charge *Stephen* with *Insolence, Folly, Contempt of his Brethren, and breaking the Peace of the Catholick Church; and cutting himself off from the Unity of it.* The words are, *abscindere se à Charitatis unitate, & alienum se per omnia fratribus facere.* Now I desire to know, whether these Bishops believed the necessary conjunction of *Roman* and *Catholick* together? And whether Bishop of *Rome* were thought to be the *Centre* of *Communion* in the *Catholick Church?* It is plain, they made him *the Cause of the Schism*, and thought themselves never the less in the *Catholick Church* for being out of the *Roman Communion.*

*V. Epist. Cypri. ep. 74, 75.*

In the Fourth Age the Government and Subordination of the *Catholick Church* was established in the Council of *Nice* according to ancient Custom; but we read not a word of the *Roman Catholick Church* there; or any Privilege or Authority the Bishop of *Rome* had, but within his own Province, and such as the Bishops of *Antioch* and *Alexandria* had in theirs. And when the Bishop of *Rome* in that Age interposed to restore some Bishops cast out of Communion by the Eastern Bishops, they declared against it as a Violation of the Rules of the *Catholick Church*; and this became the Occasion of the first Breach between the Eastern and Western Churches. In the same Age *Liberius*, Bishop of *Rome*, joyned with the Eastern Bishops in casting *Athanasius* out of the *Catholick Church*, and subscribed the *Arian Confession of Faith*; as both *Hilary* and S. *Jerome* witness; and it appears from his Seventh *Epistle*, and the old Lesson in the *Roman Breviary*, 19 *Kal. Sept.* which hath been since expunged for telling Tales.

In

In the Fifth Age happened a greater Breach between the Biſhops of *Rome* and the *Eaſtern Churches*. For *Acacius* the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, not complying with what the Biſhops of *Rome* deſired from him, was ſolemnly excommunicated by *Felix* III. But notwithſtanding this, the Emperor and Eaſtern Biſhops continued ſtill in his Communion; and they complained that the Proceedings againſt him were againſt the Rules of the Church, and ſavoured of great Pride, as appears by the Epiſtles of *Gelaſius*, who ſucceeded *Felix*. And upon this a notorious Schiſm happened, which the Eaſtern Churches charged the Church of *Rome* with; and believed themſelves to be ſtill in the Communion of the *Catholick Church*. *Epiſt.* 4. 8.

In the Sixth Age *Vigilius* Biſhop of *Rome* gives an undeniable Evidence of the Difference between *Communion* with the *Catholick Church* and with the *Biſhop of Rome*. When he went to *Conſtantinople*, upon *Juſtinian*'s Summons, about the Three *Chapters*, not only the Church of *Rome*, but that of *Africa*, *Sardinia*, *Iſtria*, *Illyricum* and others, earneſtly entreated him not to conſent to the condemning them; accordingly when he came to *Conſtantinople* he was ſo warm and zealous in the Cauſe, that he forthwith excommunicates the Patriarch and his Adherents; among whom the Empreſs her ſelf was one: But ſoon after he was ſo much mollified, that he not only took off his Sentence, but privately agreed with the Emperour to condemn the *Three Chapters*. Which was diſcovered to the Weſtern Churches by *Ruſticus* and *Sebaſtianus*, who were then with him: Whereupon they cried out upon him *for prevaricating and betraying the Council of Chalcedon*; and the *African* Biſhops not only condemned his Judgment, *but excommunicated him and all that conſented to it*; and ſo did the Biſhops of *Illyricum*. Which Schiſm continued many Years, as appears by the Epiſtles of *Pelagius* II. and *Gregory*. *Vigilius* finding how the Matter was reſented in the Weſtern Churches, yields to a General Council; which the Emperor Summon'd at *Conſtantinople*; in the mean time he publiſhes an *Edict* againſt the *Three Chapters*. *Vigilius* to recover his Credit with the Weſtern Biſhops, denounces Excommunication againſt thoſe that yielded to it; but the *Greeks* deſpiſed his *Cenſure*, and immediately went to celebrate Divine Offices. When the Council ſate he refuſed to come; which they regarded not, but went on and condemned the *Three Chapters* without him; but when the Council was ended he complied with it; as now appears from the *Authentick Acts* lately publiſhed. *Facund. l.* 4. *c.* 3. *Victor. Tunun. Poſt Coſſ. Baſil* X. *Nova Collect. Concil. p.* 1551.

Let any Man now judge, whether *Communion* with the Biſhop of *Rome* were then looked on as a neceſſary Condition of being in the *Catholick Church*, either by the Eaſtern or Weſtern Churches.

In the Seventh Age there is a Neceſſity to make a Diſtinction between the *Communion* with the Biſhop of *Rome*, and with the *Catholick Church*; becauſe *Honorius* then Biſhop of *Rome* is condemned by the Sixth General Council, *for contradicting the Apoſtolical Doctrine, and the Definitions of Councils, and for following the falſe Doctrines of Hereticks*. And the ſame Judgment is confirmed by the Seventh and Eighth Councils, which are received for General in the Church of *Rome*. And *Leo* I. in his Epiſtle to the Emperour, wherein he confirms the Sixth Council, expreſly Anathematizes his Predeceſſor *Honorius* for no leſs *than betraying the Catholick Faith*. And in the Profeſſion of Faith made by every new Biſhop of *Rome* (extant in the *Diurnus*) *Honorius* is Anathematized by Name. Was it then the *Roman Catholick Church* which joyned in Communion with *Honorius*?

In

In the Eighth Age the Bishop of *Rome* approved the Second Council of *Nice*; but notwithstanding the Western Churches stiffly opposed it, *as contrary to Faith*; which they could not have done, if at that time the Pope had been looked on as the *Head* and *Center* of *Catholick Communion.*

In the Ninth Age happened the great Breach between the Two Patriarchs of *Rome* and *Constantinople*, which in Consequence engaged the Eastern and Western Churches against each other. And although the restoring of *Photius* after the Death of *Ignatius* seemed to put an end to it; yet the Difference increased chiefly upon Two Points, that of *Jurisdiction* and *the Addition to the Creed*, made by the Western Church, which the Council under *Photius* did Anathematize; and the whole *Greek Church*, with the Four Patriarchs, joyned in it; as arguing Imperfection in the Creed and the Tradition of their Fore-fathers. And upon these Two Points this *Schism* began; although *Photius* did charge the *Latin* Church with other things; which made *Nicholaus* I. to employ the best Pens they had to defends the *Latins* against the *Greeks*. One of which was *Ratramnus* lately published, who lived at that time; and it is observable in him, That he supposes both to be still *Parts of the Catholick Church*; and he often distinguishes the *Latin Church* or the *whole Roman Communion*, from the *Catholick Church*; which he saith, *was extended from the East to the West, from the North to the South.*

*Ratramn. c. Græc. apud Dacher. Spicil. To.* 2, p. 3; 24, 27, 29, 53, 54, 60, 61, 62.

In the Eleventh Age this *Schism* brake forth with greater Violence, in the time of *Leo* IX. and *Michael Cerularius* Patriarch of *Constantinople*. To the former Occasions of Difference, a new one was added, never mention'd in *Photius* his time, *viz. the use of unleavened Bread in the Sacrament*, by the *Latin* Church. Of this, with other things, *Michael Cerularius* complained; the Pope sends *Three Nuntio's* to *Constantinople*, who behaved themselves rudely and insolently towards the Patriarch; as he shews in his Epistles to the Patriarch of *Antioch*, published lately by *Cotelerius*; there he declares *he would not treat with them about Religion without the other Patriarchs*; upon which they pronounced them *obstinate*, and proceeded to Excommunicate the *whole Greek Church* for not complying with them. And the Patriarch returned the Kindness and Anathematized them. The Form of the *Anathema* against the *Greeks* is printed with *Humbertus*; and the short of it is, *whosoever contradicts the* Roman See *is to be excluded Catholick Communion, and be made Anathema Maranatha.*

*Monumenta Græc. To.* 2. p. 138. n. 6. p. 164. n. 3, 4, 5.

*Canis. Antiq. Lect. To.* 6. p. 197.

This was plain Dealing; but it was the Eleventh Age before things came to this height. And yet in that very *Anathema* one of the Reasons assigned, was *because the* Greeks *like the* Donatists *confined the* Catholick Church *to themselves.*

Pag. 196.

*Innocent* III. *Ep. l.* 1. 353.

In the Thirteenth Age *Innocent* III. writes to the *Greek Emperor* to bring the *Greeks* back to the Unity of the Church; the Patriarch of *Constantinople* writes back again *to know what he meant by it, and how he could call the Roman Church, the One Catholick Church, since Christians made but one Flock under their several Pastors, Christ himself being Head over all.* The Pope answers, *The Church is called Catholick Two ways*; 1. *As it consists of all particular Churches, and so he grants the Roman Church is not the Catholick Church, but a part of it, though the chief.* 2. *As it holds under it all particular Churches*; *and so*, he saith, *The Roman Church only is the Catholick Church.* And so he makes owning the *Roman Church* to be *Mother and Mistress of all Churches*, as he there saith, to be a necessary Condition of Catholick Communion. And thus it becomes the *Roman Catholick Church.* But this was a very new Notion of the *Catholick Church*, which

*Lib.* 2. 208.

*Ep.* 209.

which in the Fathers of the Church was taken in one of these two Senses.

1. *With respect to Faith*, and so *Catholick* was the same with *Sound* and *of a right Faith*, in Opposition to the Notorious *Heresies* of the First Ages. So it was used by *Ignatius*, against the *Heresies* of that time, which denied *Jesus to be Christ*, *therefore*, saith he, *Wherever Christ Jesus is*, *there is the* Catholick Church. After him *Polycarp* is called by the Church of *Smyrna*, *Bishop of the* Catholick Church *in* Smyrna. So the Council of *Antioch* speaking of the Deposition of *Paulus Samosatenus* say, *They must set another Bishop over the* Catholick Church *there*. *Clemens Alexandrinus* saith, *The* Catholick Church *is ancienter than Heresies*; *that it hath the Unity of the Faith*, *and subsists only in the Truth*. *Pacianus* observes, *That in those Ages the Hereticks went by other Names*, *but the sound Christians were known by the Name of* Catholicks, *which had been of very ancient Use in the Church*, *though not found in Scripture*; as *Fulgentius* likewise observes. But *Lactantius* takes notice that the *Hereticks* had gotten the Trick of using that *Name*; and then his Rule is to discern the true *Catholick Church* by the *true Religion*. For he not only saith before, *That the* Catholick Church *is to be known by the true Worship of God*; but when he comes to lay down the Notes of the true Church, the first of them is *Religion*. So I find in an old *Lactantius*, printed at *Rome*, *A. D.* 1470. but, for what Reason I know not, it is left out in the latter Editions. In the Conference between the *Donatists* and the Catholick *Bishops*, both sides challenged the Name of *Catholicks* to themselves; and the *Roman* Judge determined, *It should belong to them who were found to have Truth on their side*. Pope *Innocent* III. in a Council at *Rome* declares, *That all the Churches in the World are called one from the Unity of the* Catholick *Faith*. And in the Canon before, he mentions *the* Roman Church *as distinct from the* Catholick, but comprehended under it while it adheres to *the* Catholick Faith. Which was not then understood to be what the *Roman Church* declares to be so; but what was universally received in the Church from the Apostles times, and was delivered in the Creeds to the Persons to be admitted by Baptism into *the* Catholick Church.

*Ignat. ad Smyrn. p. 6.* *Euseb. l. 4. c. 14. l. 7. c. 24.* *Strom. l. 7. p. 764, 765.* *Pacian. Ep. 1.* *Fulgent. Op. p. 63.* *Lactant. Instit. l. 4. c. ult.* *Sola igitur Catholica est quæ verum Cultum retinet.* *Baluz. Concil. p. 286.* *Supplem. Concil. Gall. p. 14. Can. 6.*

2. *With respect to Persons and Places*. And so *Catholick* was first taken in opposition to the *Jewish* Confinement of Salvation to themselves; and of God's appointed Worship to one Temple. So *Ignatius* saith, *The Church is one Body*, *made up of* Jews *and* Gentiles. And the Church of *Smyrna* writes *to all the Members of the* Catholick Church *in all Places*: and the Council of *Antioch* writes to the *whole* Catholick Church *under Heaven*. S. *Cyril* saith, *The Church is called* Catholick *from its Universal spreading and teaching the whole Doctrine of Christ to all sorts of Persons*. *Athanasius* saith, *It is called* Catholick, *because it is dispersed over the World*. *Theophylact* saith, *The* Catholick Church *is a Body made up of all Churches*, *whereof Christ is the Head*. And the *African* Bishops from the first beginning of the Dispute with the *Donatists* laid great weight upon this, That *the* Catholick Church *was to be taken in its largest Extent*; *or else the Promises could not be fulfilled*; as may be seen in *Optatus*, who saith, *The Church is called* Catholick, *not only from its having the true Faith*, *but from its being every where dispersed*. And S. *Augustine* hath written whole Books to prove it. In the Conference with the *Donatists*, the *Catholick*

*Epist. ad Smyrn.* *Euseb. l. 4. c. 14. l. 7. c. 24.* *Cyrill. Catech. 18. p. 220.* *Athanas. To. 2. p. 402.* *Theophyl. in 1 Cor. 12. 27.* *Opt. c. Par. l. 2. cum inde dicta sit Catholica, quod sit rationabilis & ubique diffusa.*

Bishops, and especially S. *Augustin*, plead, that they are called *Catholicks* because *they hold communion with the whole World of Christians, and not with those only of a particular Title or Denomination.* For therein they made the Schism of the *Donatists* consist; not barely in a *causeless Separation*; but in confining *the* Catholick Church *to themselves*, who at best were but a Part of it. And because the Notion which *Innocent* III. gives, is liable to the same Charge, it cannot be excused from the same guilt.

*Baluz. Coll. Concil. p.* 287, 288.

*Nos universo orbi Christiano communione cohæremus, n.* 100.

*Et appellantur & merito sunt Catholici ipsa sua communione nomen testantes. Catholon enim secundùm totum dicitur. Qui autem à toto separatus est, partemque defendit ab universo præcisam, non sibi usurpet hoc nomen, sed nobiscum teneat veritatem, n.* 101.

Thus we have found the Author of this Notion of the *Roman Catholick Church*, viz. for such as own the Supremacy of the *Church* of *Rome*, as he explains it more fully in the same Epistle.

But yet this Notion of the *Catholick Church* was not Universally received after *Innocent* III. For in the Fifteenth Age, in the Council of *Florence*, Cardinal *Bessarion* disputing with the *Grecks* about the Authority of the *Roman Church*, in making an Addition to the Creed, said, *That how great soever the Power of the* Roman Church *be, he grants it is less than that of a General Council, or the* Catholick Church. From whence it follows, that the Notion of the Catholick Church cannot be taken from owning the *Roman Church to be Mistress of all Churches*; for then the *Catholick Church* is bound to submit to the Decrees of the *Roman Church* about Matters of Faith.

*Concil. Florent. Sess.* 9.

In the beginning of the same Age the Council of *Constance* met, and in the Fourth Session declared, *That a General Council represents the* Catholick Church, *and hath its Power immediately from Christ; and that in Matters of Faith, Unity of the Church, and Reformation, all Persons, even Popes themselves are bound to submit to it.* And truly it was but necessary for them to take off from the Pope's Authority in Matters of Faith, since they charge *John* XXIII. with no less than *frequent and pertinacious denying the Immortality of the Soul.* Was not this Man fit to be an Infallible Head of the *Catholick Church*, and the true Center of Christian Communion? *Bellarmine* saith, *this Article was not proved, but only commonly believed, because of the dissoluteness of his Life.* But this is but a poor Defence; since this Article stands upon Record against him in all the Editions of the Council of *Constance*; which I have compared; even that at *Rome*, said to be collated with Manuscripts. And why should *so scandalous an Article be* suffered to stand, unless there were such a consent of Copies that it could not for shame be removed?

*Concil. Constant. Sess.* 11. *Concil. Gen. To.* 12. *p.* 87. *De Rom. Pont. l.* 4. *c.* 14.

The Doctrine of the Council of *Constance* was confirmed by the Council of *Basil*, and is to this Day maintained by the Clergy of *France*, as appears by their Declaration made *A. D.* 1682. From whence it follows, that the Church is not called *Catholick* from relation to the *Roman Church*; but *to the whole Body of Christians*: and that the *Unity* of it, is not to be taken from the respect it bears to an *external Visible Head* which may fail, but to Christ *as the essential Head of the Church.* This is the express Doctrine of the *Cardinal de Alliaco*, *Joh. Major*, *Almain*, *Gerson* and many others; and follows from the Decree of the Council of *Constance*.

Thus I have briefly deduced the Sense of the Christian Church in this Matter from the Apostolical times; and that not meerly from the Sayings of particular Men; but from publick, solemn, and undoubted Acts of the Church. Which I have the rather done, because the *Defender* saith, *we have no Antiquity on our side in this Cause, but as much as since* Luther. I

*Def. p.* 23.

think

think I have produced a little more, and too much for him to *Anſwer*.

It is time now to conſider what Proof the Replier brings, *that* Catholick *and* Roman Catholick *in the Senſe of Antiquity were one and the ſame thing*.

He produces the Teſtimonies of *Tertullian* and *Cyprian*, *wherein the* Church *of* Rome *is called the* Catholick Church. Who doubts that in thoſe Days there was a *Catholick Church* at *Rome*? For every particular Church which agreed in the *Catholick Faith* was then called the *Catholick Church* of ſuch a Place. And innumerable Inſtances of this kind may be gathered out of Antiquity; both as to the City of *Rome*, and other Cities as well as that; and ſurely they were not all *Catholick Churches* in his Senſe; when he agrees there is but *One Catholick Church*; nay more, even *Parochial Churches* were called *Catholick*, as he may find in *Cotelerius*. Pag. 6. Not. in Monum. Græc. To. 2. p. 601.

S. *Ambroſe*'s Teſtimony ſignifies no more, *than that* Satyrus *coming into a Place ſuſpected for the* Luciferian *Schiſm, asked if the Biſhop joyned with the* Catholick *Biſhops*, i. e. *with the* Roman Church. Which is no more than whether he agreed with his own Church; for *Satyrus* was a *Roman* born. But this would prove any other Church to be the *One* Catholick Church altogether as well as the *Roman*.

The Patriarch of *Conſtantinople* writes to *Hormiſda*, *that he would not hereafter recite in the Diptychs the Names of thoſe who were excommunicated by the Apoſtolical See*. And what follows? *But* he ſaith, *They were ſever'd from the Communion of the* Catholick Church. And ſo were thoſe excommunicated by the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*. But the Words are, *who do not in all things conſent with the See Apoſtolick*; but the plain Meaning is, of thoſe who were caſt out of Communion, for the Words are too, *Sequeſtratos à Communione Eccleſiæ Catholicæ*. And doth this prove the *Roman* Church to have any more Relation to the *Catholick*, than the Church of the meaneſt Biſhop in the *Catholick Church*?

As to the calling of *Catholick Romaniſts* by the Gothick *Arians*; that relates to the *Roman Empire*, and not to the *Roman Church*.

And now let any impartial Reader judge whether the Senſe of *Antiquity* be not admirably cleared by theſe Paſſages, as to the making out *Roman* and *Catholick* to be the ſame. But to proceed.

(3.) I ſaid farther, that if the Roman Church believed it ſelf to be the Catholick Church, it muſt void the Baptiſm of thoſe who are out of its Communion; but ſince Baptiſm doth enter Perſons into the Catholick Church, by its own Confeſſion, the Catholick Church which is owned in the Creeds, muſt be of larger Extent than the Roman.

In Anſwer to this, they both tell me *this Point hath been over-ruled long ago by the Catholick Church*; *the Baptiſm of Hereticks being allowed to be good*. Reply p. 8. Defence p. 7. But ſince it is granted, that Baptiſm doth enter Perſons into that *Catholick Church we believe in the Creeds*, doth it not evidently follow, that the *Catholick Church in the Creeds* is larger than the *Roman Communion*? *For it takes in thoſe which the other doth not*. Doth not the *Catholick Church* take in all that are admitted into the *Catholick Church*? But many more by their own Confeſſion are admitted into it than are of the *Roman Communion*, and therefore it unavoidably follows, that the *Roman Catholick Church* cannot be the Catholick Church believed in the two Creeds.

And although according to S. *Auguſtine*, the Validity of Baptiſm depends on the right Form of Words, and not the good Diſpoſition of him that adminiſters; yet Baptiſm where it is valid muſt have its due Effect, which is entring Perſons into the Catholick Church.

But say they, *Doth not Heresie*, &c. *cast them out of the* Catholick Church? Suppose it doth, yet if Heresie do cast them out, they were in the Church till they were cast out of it. Their being allowed to be in it doth my Business; let them prove them cast out by Heresie when they please. But the Defender saith, *I suppose what I should prove, and then prove it by Means of that Supposition.* Pag. 8.

Here I am to seek; for do I not prove from their *own Supposition* and not from *mine*, that Baptism doth enter Persons into the Catholick Church? And therefore from thence I prove, that themselves cannot believe the *Catholick and Roman Church* to be all one; since they allow many multitudes to be entred into the *Catholick Church*, which they deny to be of *the* Roman Church.

Pag. 9. Yet he goes on, *That such Persons are not truly Members either of the* Catholick *or* Roman Catholick Church. No? then Baptism doth not admit Persons into the *Catholick Church*. Which is very new Doctrine, and fit only for new Converts, and is directly contrary to the Roman Catechism, which saith, *Baptism is the Gate by which we enter into the* Church. *Catech. Rom. Part* 1. *c.* 10. *n.* 20. *They were so far Members*, saith he, *as Baptism could make them.* And that I hope was to make them Members of Christ's Body; or else what becomes of the Council of *Trent*, which so expresly asserts, and that with an *Anathema*, *the Validity and Efficacy of the Sacraments in general*, and of *Baptism in particular*? And there is a special *Anathema against those who say that Children baptized are not to be reckon'd* inter fideles, and I hope those are Members of *the* Catholick Church. Is there Remission of Sins, Communion with the Holy Spirit granted out of *the* Catholick Church? Yet these are the *Effects* of *Baptism*, owned by all Persons in the Church of *Rome*; or else they cannot themselves be of the Roman Communion. What is it then I pray *to be as much Members of the* Church *as Baptism could make them*? What can make them more *Members* than Baptism doth? According to their own Doctrine. *But they are as far off the* Roman Church *as they are off the* Catholick. Say you so? Then no more is requisite to make a Man a Member of the *Roman Church*, than is necessary to his Baptism. This is great News, and would be very welcome to the Christian World. I have heard of many Projects of Accommodation; but none seem to be like this. For then no more is necessary to make us Members of *the* Roman Church *than of the* Catholick, *i. e.* owning *the Creed and our Baptismal Vow.* Nay, hold there, saith he, *the Profession of the* Catholick Faith *is necessary to make one a true Member of the* Roman Catholick Church. This is the Meaning of a whole Page, or else it has none: Suppose this to be true; and it proves what I intend. For either this *Catholick Faith* is the same which was required to Baptism, or not. If the same, then no more is required than owning the Creeds, to make a Member of *the* Roman Catholick Church; if not the same, then those who are *Members of the* Catholick Church *by* Baptism, are not *Members* of the *Roman Catholick* till a farther Profession of the *Roman Faith*; and consequently the *Catholick Church* and the *Roman Catholick* are not the same, since those may be Members of the *Catholick Church*, who are not of the *Roman Catholick*. Can any thing be plainer? Pag. 10. Pag. 7.

And the Replier is so much a Gentleman, to own the Truth of it. For these are his Words, *That Baptism enters Persons into the Catholick Church, who though they be out of the Communion of the Roman Church, yet having the true form of Baptism, are Members of the Catholick Church.* There- Reply p. 8.

fore

fore *the* Catholick Church, *and* Roman Catholick cannot be the ſame. Which was all I intended to prove.

But he ſaith, *That as Baptiſm enters them into the* Catholick Church, *ſo Hereſie, Apoſtaſie, or Infidelity caſts them out; or elſe the old Hereticks, which he reckons up, were ſtill Members of the Catholick Church.* I anſwer, That my Argument was not concerning the *old Hereticks*, who rejected any Article of the *Creed*, which was delivered at *Baptiſm*, and the owning of it required in order to it; but concerning the *Roman Catholick Church*, which makes the owning New Articles of Faith neceſſary in order to its Communion; and if this Church reject any from its Communion who do own the Articles of the Creeds, it follows from thence, that it is not the Catholick Church into which Perſons are admitted by Baptiſm.

*But no Man if an Heretick, though baptized, can remain in the Church.* Pag. 9. If he be convicted of renouncing the Creed, upon the owning whereof he was received to Baptiſm, he caſts himſelf out of the Church; for he doth not ſtand to his Promiſe. If you mean that any thing which the *Roman Catholick Church* declares to be *Hereſie*, caſts a Man out of the *Catholick Church*, I do utterly deny it, and I ſee no Reaſon brought to prove it.

(4.) I argued, that in a divided State of the Church, there may be different Communions, and yet both may remain Parts of the *Catholick Church*; for which I inſtanced in the Excommunications of old about keeping *Eaſter*, and the Differences between the Eaſtern and Weſtern Churches; but to appropriate the Title of the One Catholick Church to any one of the divided Parties, ſo as to exclude the reſt, was to charge that Party with the *Schiſm*, as in the Caſe of the *Novatians* and *Donatiſts*; and conſequently, to apply the One Catholick Church to the Roman, was to make it guilty of the preſent *Schiſm* in the Chriſtian World.

Both the Defender and Replier behave themſelves in their Anſwers to this, as if they did not underſtand what I aimed at; and therefore run out into things by the bye, as if they thought there were no Difference between ſaying ſomething to a Book, and giving an Anſwer to it. What I can pick up, which ſeems material, I will ſet down diſtinctly.

The Replier takes Notice that I ſaid, *That before the Unhappy Diviſions of the Chriſtian Church it had been no Difficulty to have ſhewed that one viſible Church which Chriſt had here upon Earth*; to which he anſwers, *That there were Diviſions in the Apoſtles times, and the ſame Means which were then uſed to preſerve the Unity of the Catholick Church, did equally ſerve for after Ages and continue to this Day, and ſo the Unity of the Catholick Church is ſtill as viſible as ever it was.* Pag. 9, 10. This in few Words I take to be the Force of what he ſaith. But certainly there was a time when the Unity of the *Catholick Church* was a little more diſcernable than now it is. Doth not the Scripture tell us, *the Multitude was of one Heart and one Soul?* Are all Chriſtians ſo at this Day? I grant afterward there were *Schiſms* and *Hereſies* in the Apoſtolical Churches. But the Apoſtles had an Infallible Spirit, which they manifeſted by the Power of Miracles going along with it, by which Means the *Hereſies* were laid open and the *Schiſms* ſtopped. But what were thoſe *Hereſies*? Such as contradicted the *Articles of the Creed*, as about the *Truth of Chriſt's Incarnation*, and the *Reſurrection of the Dead*, &c. and therefore the Apoſtles by the Aſſiſtance of that Infallible Spirit did write Epiſtles to the Churches, to declare that which was to be the ſtanding Faith of all Ages; and by an unqueſtionable Tradition (in the Church

of

of *Rome)* they ſumm'd up theſe Fundamental Points of Faith in that which is therefore called *the Apoſtles Creed.* This was therefore the Standard whereby to judge of *Faith* and *Hereſie*; and by this, they proceeded in the Ages ſucceeding the Apoſtles. Afterwards, ſome did not barefaced contradict the Articles of the *Creed*, but broached ſuch Doctrines as did by Conſequence overthrow them; as the *Arians* by making a *Creature God*, the *Neſtorians* and *Eutychians* denying in effect the Truth of *Chriſt's Incarnation*; againſt theſe the *General Councils* aſſembled and the Eaſtern and Weſtern Churches joyned in condemning them; not from their own Authority as Supreme or Infallible Judges; but as the moſt Authentick Witneſſes of the true Apoſtolical Doctrine. And thus the Creed was enlarged by general Conſent through the *whole Catholick Church*, and that which was called the *Nicene Creed* was made the Standard of *Catholick Communion.*

*Concil. Epheſ. Part 2. Act. 6. Chalcedon. Act. 5.* But to prevent any Miſchief by overcharging the Creed, the General Council of *Epheſus* did *abſolutely forbid any farther additions to be made to it*, and the Council of *Chalcedon* ratified that prohibition. All that they pretended to, was only to give the true Senſe of the Articles therein received about the Incarnation of Chriſt, and the ſame was declared by the Fifth and Sixth General Councils; whereof the one was to clear the Council of *Chalcedon* from favouring *Neſtorianiſm*, and the other to ſhew that the *Humane Nature* in Chriſt was perfect, as to the Affections of the Soul as well as the Body.

But after this, a mighty Breach happen'd between the Eaſtern and Weſtern Churches; and ſetting aſide the different Cuſtoms in both (which might eaſily have been compoſed) there were two things, which made this Breach irreconcileable.

1. The Weſtern Churches taking upon them to make a New Addition to the Creed; as to *the Spirit's proceeding from the Son*; without asking the Conſent of the Eaſtern Churches.

2. The Biſhop of *Rome*'s aſſuming to himſelf an Authority of *Headſhip over the Catholick Church.* They did not deny him *a Primacy of Order*, as he had the Firſt Patriarchal See; but when he took upon him to exerciſe Juriſdiction in the other Patriarchates as well as his own, and ſent Legates for that purpoſe, they rejected his Authority, and ſo the Breach continued.

Def. p. 14. But the Defender ſaith, *The Popes Supremacy, if his Memory fail him not, was not ſo much as made a pretence till near* 200 *Years after the Schiſm began, nor any where more acknowledged than in* Greece, *nor by any Body more than by him that began the Schiſm.* If his Memory fail him not, I am ſure, ſomething elſe doth. For nothing can be more notorious from the very Epiſtles of the *Popes* on Occaſion of this Schiſm, than that this was at the bottom of all; whatever Pretences might be made uſe of ſometimes to palliate the Matter. Let him but read the Epiſtles of *Leo* I. to *Anatolius* and concerning him; the Epiſtles of *Gregory* I. about the Title of Oecumenical Patriarch; the Epiſtles of *Nicolaus* I. concerning *Photius*; of *Leo* IX. concerning *Michael Cerularius*, and I think he will be of another Opinion; and that the Controverſie about Supremacy, to the Scandal of the Chriſtian World, was the true Occaſion of that dreadful Schiſm. But all the Eaſtern Churches I ſaid however different among themſelves to this Day, look on the Pope's Supremacy as an Innovation to the Church.

To

To which the Replier ſaith, *The Eaſtern Churches were divided from the Roman Catholick Church by ſuch Doctrines as are inconſiſtent with the Church of* England *which profeſſes to hold with the Four Firſt General Councils.* Pag. 15.

I will not deny but the Breach as to the *Neſtorians* began on the account of the Council of *Epheſus*; but whether the Chriſtians under the *Turk* and *Perſians* in *Aſia* are truely *Neſtorians* is another Queſtion: I think not, for this Reaſon. In the beginning of this Century, the Patriarch of thoſe Chriſtians called his moſt Learned Men about him to conſider what their Doctrine really was, and how far they differ'd from the Roman Church about Chriſt; ſince the Miſſionaries from thence, ſtill charged them with Hereſie: and they declared the difference to be only in Words and the manner of explication. For however they ſay that every Nature hath a Perſon inſeparable from it (by which they mean no more than a Subſiſtence) yet from the Union of theſe two in Chriſt, they hold that there is but of one *Parſopa* they call it, or *One Son* reſulting from the Union of both Natures. And as long as they hold a real Union of both Natures and *one Filiation* (as they ſpeak) reſulting from it, it is beyond my Underſtanding that they ſhould be guilty of the *Neſtorian Hereſie.* And this Account was given to *Paul* V. by one ſent from their Patriarch, and ordered to be Printed by him at *Rome.* But is it not really a very hard Caſe for 300000 Families, who as it is there ſaid *were under that Patriarch*, to be excluded *the Catholick Church*, and conſequently from Salvation, for not right underſtanding the Subtilties of the Diſtinction between *Nature* and *Perſon*; as, whether Subſiſtence can be ſeparated from Individual Nature; or whether an Hypoſtatical Union doth imply that the Individual Nature doth loſe its own Subſiſtence? I appeal to the Conſcience of any good Chriſtian, whether he thinks Chriſt and his Apoſtles did ever make the Knowledge of theſe Things neceſſary to Salvation; which the ſubtileſt of their Schoolmen are never able to explain to the Capacities of the far greateſt part of Mankind. *Pet. Stroza, de Dogmat. Chaldæ. in Proleg. c. 3. Rom. 1617.*

The like may be ſaid, as to thoſe called *Eutychians*, I do not doubt but the Confuſion of both Natures in Chriſt was a Doctrine juſtly condemned by the Council of *Chalcedon*, becauſe he could not be true Man, if the Nature of Man were loſt in him; but I think there is no Reaſon to condemn thoſe for that *Hereſie*, who declare they reject the Doctrine of *Eutyches*, and that they hold *two Natures in Chriſt making up one Perſonated Nature without Mixture or Confuſion*, as their Patriarch explained their Doctrine to *Leonardus Abel* Biſhop of *Sidon*, whom *Gregory* XIII. ſent his *Nuncio* into thoſe Parts, on purpoſe to underſtand their Doctrines. And the latter Miſſionaries confirm the ſame thing; that they do not deny two Natures in Chriſt, but ſay that two Natures are as Parts making up by their Union one Nature with a Perſon. And herein they ſay, *Dioſcorus*, whom they follow, differ'd from *Eutyches*. And muſt ſuch infinite Numbers of this Perſwaſion in the Eaſtern and Weſtern Parts be excluded from the *Catholick Church* for not knowing the Difference between a Perſon reſulting from the Union of two Natures; and one Nature without a Perſon ariſing from two Natures without Mixture or Confuſion? A late Writer of the Roman Communion is ſo ingenuous to acknowledge *that the Hereſies charged on the Eaſtern Churches are imaginary and that they differ only in terms, from that which is owned to be the Catholick Faith.* *Apud Thom. à Jeſu. l. 7. c. 14.* *Philipp. à SS. Trinit. Itiner. Orient. l. 5. c. 5.* *Sacchin. Hiſt. Societ. Jeſu. l. 6. 12. 123.* *Voyage du Mont. Liban du Daudini Remarques ſur* Chap. 26. Pag. 383.

And *Fauſtus Naironus* hath lately publiſhed a Book at *Rome* to prove that the *Maronites* have been all along good Catholicks; although the Popes in their Bulls from the Time of *Innocent* III. have ſtill charged them with Hereſie. *Diſſert. de Origine, Nomine & Religione Maronitarum.*

As

As to the *Greeks*, there is yet less Reason to charge them with *Heresie*; since they adhere to the Four General Councils; and out of Zeal for the Decree of the Council of *Ephesus*, will not allow the Addition which the Western Church made to the Creed.

So that upon the whole Matter, there is nothing to exclude the Eastern Churches from being *Parts of the Catholick Church*, but denying the Pope's Supremacy.

Pag. 15. But he tells us, *Some of these (if his Authors deceive him not) as the* Egyptians *and* Ethiopians *have often made Overtures to the Pope for Peace and Communion, owning him for Supreme Head of the Church, provided only they might not be obliged to renounce* Eutyches *and* Dioscorus. I am extremely afraid his Authors have deceived him, I wish he had named them that others might beware of them. I suppose he means that which *Baronius* printed at the end of his Sixth Tome, of a solemn Embassy from the Patriarch of *Alexandria* and all the Provinces of *Egypt* to own the *Pope as Supreme Head of the Church*; which was soon after found to be a meer Cheat and Imposture. How far the *Ethiopians* are from owning the Pope's Authority he may find in *Ludolphus*, or *Balthasar Tellez*. It is true the Pope sent a Patriarch into *the East* upon a Division among themselves; but after a while, he was forced to withdraw to the remotest Parts of *Persia*, and to leave their own Patriarch in full Power. The Bishop of *Sidon* relates, what ill Success he had with the Patriarch of the *Jacobites*. And it is well known how soon the *Greeks* returned to their old Opposition after the Council of *Florence*. I had therefore Reason to say, that all the Churches of the *East* however different among themselves agreed in rejecting the Pope's Supremacy, and to this day look on it as an Innovation in the Church.

*Thom. à Jesu. de Concil. omn. Gent. l. 7. c. 6.*

Pag. 16. As to what he afterwards speaks of their *Blasphemies against the Divinity and Humanity of Christ*, I now leave the World to judge of them; and if they be true, all Men must condemn the Pope's *Missionaries* for notorious Liars; for the Judgment I make of them; is from the Relations they have given us. And if these be true, I can by no means allow them to be excluded from being *Parts* of the *Catholick Church*; and so that must be of far greater extent than the *Roman-Catholick Church*. But to go on.

I observed that which I thought a material Difference in the Schisms of the Church, some I said were consistent with both Parties remaining in the *Catholick Church*; for which I instanced in the Bishops of *Rome* Excommunicating the Bishops of *Asia*, about *Easter*; and those of *Asia* and *Africa* about *Re-baptizing*. Others were for excluding all out of the Church but themselves, as the *Novatians* and *Donatists*.

Pag. 11. The *Replier* tells me *he doth not think this Difference at all material.* For what Reason? *Because the Church is the last Tribunal in all Differences; and whosoever separates from her is to be reputed as a Heathen or a Publican.* It seems then the Bishops of *Asia* for not keeping *Easter* with Pope *Victor*, were as very *Heathens* and *Publicans* as the *Novatians* and *Donatists*. I hope this Gentleman after all, will not make the Church so severe in all its Censures, to cut Men presently off from being Members of the *Catholick Church*. I had learnt from S. *Augustin*, *That Excommunications are sometimes used by way of Discipline to bring Persons to a sense of their Faults, and not to cut them off from the People of God.* But suppose *Excommunications* should always cut Persons off from the *Catholick Church*, is it not to be supposed that they are just and reasonable? Suppose the Matter doth not deserve it, or there be false Suggestions, or a precipitate Sentence;

*Aug. c. Donat. p. 6. Collat. c. 20.*

is

is it really all one, if the Church happens to Excommunicate? But beſide all this, ſuppoſe one Biſhop in the Church takes upon him to Excommunicate others for little or no cauſe, and againſt the Advice of his Brethren; which was the Caſe of *Victor* about the *Aſian* Biſhops; muſt they be cut off from the *Catholick Church* as effectually, as if they had been guilty of the greateſt *Hereſie* or *Schiſm*?

But not to affix too ſevere a Cenſure on the *Replier*, in the next Page he doth acknowledge a material Difference; which he ſaith was, *That the whole Church was not yet engaged, and till a Deciſion be made by the whole Church, the Parts may Excommunicate each other, and remain Parts of the Church ſtill.* Now this, in my Opinion, makes very much for me. For in this divided ſtate of the Chriſtian World, the *whole Church* is not engaged as to any Deciſion of the preſent Differences; and therefore no Parts can be cut off by other Parts from the *Catholick Church*. For, ſince the Breaches of *Chriſtendom*, there hath been no Repreſentative of the *Catholick Church*; and is not like to be; and ſo the divided Parts remain Parts of the *Catholick Church* ſtill. The Council of *Trent* was ſo far from it, that the famous Abbot of *S. Cyprian* called it a *Cabal of Schoolmen influenced by the Pope.* And there is a great deal of Difference between the Deciſion of Schoolmen and of the *Catholick Church.*

Pag. 12, 13.

*Prejugés legit. contre le Janſeniſm.* p. 135.

I cannot but ſtill think it material to obſerve, that in *Schiſms* of the moſt dangerous Nature, the Fault was laid on that Part which appropriated the Title of the *Catholick Church* to it ſelf, as in the *Novatians* and *Donatiſts*.

Here the *Defender* puts in his Exceptions; for he ſaith, *It ſounds, as if I would have that Title never rightly applied, but to thoſe who do not challenge it; in likelihood becauſe they have no pretence to it.* The Inſinuation is, as if I were willing any ſhould be called the *Catholick Church*, but that which is. But in earneſt, I am as much againſt any *one Part* being called *the Whole*, as another. And from the Caſe of the *Novatians* and *Donatiſts* I have learnt to charge the *Schiſm* on thoſe, who at beſt being but a *Part* challenge the *Whole* to themſelves. *But he cannot underſtand how it comes to be Preſumption, and a cauſe of Schiſm in one Part of a Diviſion to aſſume it.* I am very ſorry for it, that he cannot underſtand it to be a Preſumption in a *Part*, to call it ſelf the *Whole*. He ſaith, *In a Diviſion, it is not well intelligible how more than one Part can bear it.* I ſay it is not at all intelligible how any *Part* can bear it. What thinks he of the *Novatians* and *Donatiſts*? Was it not Preſumption in them to arrogate the Title of the *Catholick Church* to themſelves? And were they not therefore guilty of the *Schiſm*?

Pag. 14.

In the ancient Church there were two ſorts of *Schiſms*, which I think it material to obſerve.

1. *A Factious Schiſm.*
2. *A Sacrilegious Schiſm.*

(1.) A *Factious Schiſm*; when Men out of Oppoſition to their lawful Governours, in the Church ſet up *ſeparate Aſſemblies*. Which by the Fathers are called παρασυναγωγαὶ, as by S. *Baſil* in his Epiſtle to *Amphilochius*, where he diſtinguiſheth *Hereſie*, *Schiſm* and *unlawful Meetings*. *Hereſie* is againſt ſome *neceſſary Point of Faith*; *Schiſm is a Separation from the Catholick Church about Matters of Diſcipline*; And *unlawful Aſſemblies* are ſuch as are ſet up againſt *the Rules of the Church.* Thoſe who were guilty of theſe were received upon due Submiſſion; thoſe who were guilty of *Schiſm* were to renounce their *Schiſm*; and thoſe who were guilty of

*Heresie*, were to be *re-baptized*. This was S. *Basil*'s Judgment, and is followed by *Balsamon*, *Zonaras* and *Aristinus*. And S. *Basil* himself saith, *This was the Sense of the Fathers before him.*

(2.) A *Sacrilegious Schism* is that which robs the Church of God of that which belongs to it, *i. e.* which excludes all but their own Number from being true Members of the Church. And this was the *Schism* charged on the *Novatians* and *Donatists*. This S. *Augustine* very often charges upon the latter, as a very *high piece of Schism*; for saith he, *While they confine the Church to their own Communion, they are guilty of manifest Sacrilege, both against Christ and his Church.*

C. Parmen. l. 1. c. ult. l. 2. c. 1, 11. C. Crescon. l. 4. c. 10, 11.

And whosoever follow their Steps, and exclude any Parts of the Church from being so, and confine the Church to their own Communion, they are guilty of the same *Sacrilegio s Schism*; which is of a higher Nature than a meer *Factious Schism*. But the *Defender* saith, *The Language of the World has always preserved the Title of Catholick to one Part, and given the Name of Sect or Part cut off to the other.*

Pag. 14.

By the *Language of the World*, he must mean of *that Part* which excludes the rest. Which he calls *the World* by the very same Figure by which *a Part* challenges to be *the Whole*. But in Consequence to this, for all that I can yet see, these who were excluded out of the *Catholick Church*, must be taken in by *Baptism*. And S. *Cyprian*, *Firmilian*, and S. *Basil* saw this well enough. I confess it was after carried, That *Hereticks* were to be distinguished, and those only to be Re-baptized who renounced the Baptismal Faith, in Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. And the meaning, I suppose was, that nothing but that excluded Persons out of the *Catholick Church*; and those *Hereticks* whose Baptism was allow'd, were of an inferiour sort; and by not disowning their Baptism, they shew'd they looked on them only as *corrupted Parts of the Church*. And so did the Councils of *Nice* and *Arles*; which did not utterly reject *Re-baptization*, but only *of those who preserved the Baptismal Faith*. It was not therefore the Sense of the Ancient Church, that upon every Dissension in matters of Faith from the general Doctrine of the Church, one Party must be excluded from the *Catholick Church*, and that Title belong to the other.

Concil. Nic. c. 19. Arel. c. 8.

But he proceeds, *That this Presumption cannot be the Cause of Schisms, which must happen before the Presumption.*

This is very easily answered. For a Breach there must be before; but the *Schism* belongs to those who were the *true Causes* of the Breach. If therefore any one Part assumes to it self the Right of the whole, and requires the owning it from all that joyn in Communion with it, this very act makes it justifiable (not to separate from the *Catholick Church*) but not to joyn in Communion with that Part on such unreasonable Terms.

Pag. 11.

Well, saith he, *Suppose the dividing Parts do still continue Parts of the* Catholick *Whole*; *cannot the* Roman-Catholick *be that Whole*, i. e. Suppose there be many Parts, why may not one of them be the Whole? For still, the *Roman-Catholick* is but *a Part*, though *Catholick* be *the Whole*; as though the Ocean be the whole, yet the *British*, or *Gallican*, or *Spanish*, or *Atlantick Ocean*, it but a Part of the *whole Ocean*. I am ashamed to pursue so clear a Point any farther.

Pag. 12.

But he hath one fetch behind still, *viz. That it is one Faith which makes the* Catholick Church *one*; *if therefore the Roman Catholick Church be a Part of this* Catholick *Whole, the other Parts must believe as she does, or else they cannot be Parts.*

I will endeavour to make this clear to him, and so end this Dispute.

The

The *Church* is a Society of Perſons who own and profeſs the Chriſtian Faith; Therefore Faith is neceſſary to the very Being of a Church; for unleſs they believe the *Chriſtian Doctrine*, they cannot be the Chriſtian Church. This Faith which is neceſſary to make them Chriſtians, is to be embraced by all who are Members of this *Church*; their entrance is by *Baptiſm*; the Faith is the *Creed* delivered to thoſe who are to be Baptized; which being univerſally received by Chriſtians, that makes the common Bond of Union in the Parts of this great Body; and this is the *One Faith of the* Catholick Church.

But if he thinks the *Roman-Catholick Church* can make all its Deciſions *a Part* of this *one Faith*, he is extreamly miſtaken. As will more fully appear in the following Diſcourſe.

## II. *Of the Authority of the* Catholick Church.

THE *whole and ſole Deſign of the Firſt Paper*, as the *Replier* tells me, *was to evince this Point. That all Controverſial Points of Faith, either about Holy Scripture, or other Subjects, do fall under the Judgment and Deciſion of the Church.* But, under Favour, that is not the whole Deſign of it; for this implies no more than that the Church may, if it pleaſes, decide them; but the Deſign is, to prove, That in all Matters of Faith the Churches Authority is without farther Examination to be ſubmitted to; ſo that all that Chriſtians have to do is but to enquire into Two Things. 1. Where the Church is. 2. Whether the Church hath declared its Judgment or not. Pag. 1.

And ſeveral Things are objected in the Papers againſt the not ſubmitting to the Churches Judgment, *viz. That every one will be his own Judge; which is not allowed in Common Matters, much leſs in Matters of Faith; that no ſuch Authority is given to every particular Man by Scripture; but the Churches Authority is there eſtabliſhed; and was owned in the Primitive Church in the Creeds, and about the Canonical Books; and ſince the Church had once ſuch a Power, there is no reaſon to ſuppoſe it loſt; but upon Differences happening, the Churches Judgment is to be ſubmitted to.*

This is the whole Strength and Force of the Firſt Paper; and it is about a Subject of the higheſt Importance, both as to the Satisfaction of particular Perſons, and the Peace of the Chriſtian World. And the clearing theſe Two Points will go a very great way towards the putting an end to Controverſies. 1. That in all Diſputes we are to ſearch no farther, but preſently to yield to the Judgment of the Church. 2. That the *Roman-Catholick Church* is that Church. How far I am from being ſatisfied with the latter doth already appear; I now ſet my ſelf to conſider the other.

And here are theſe Things neceſſary to be debated,

1. Whether Chriſt and his Apoſtles did eſtabliſh ſuch a ſtanding Judicature in the Church, to which all Chriſtians were bound to ſubmit in Matters of Faith?
2. Whether the Primitive Church did own ſuch a Judicature; And did accordingly govern their Faith?
3. Whether it be an unreaſonable thing to ſuppoſe the contrary, *viz.* That Chriſt ſhould leave Men to judge for themſelves in Matters which concern their Salvation, according to the Scriptures?

(1.) Whether Chriſt and his Apoſtles did eſtabliſh ſuch a ſtanding Judicature in the Church to put an end to all Controverſies which ſhould

arise about Matters of Faith? We do not Question but Christ might have done it if he had pleased; and there is no doubt he foresaw all those Inconveniences which are now objected against the want of it; But the point before us, is, Whether Christ, who alone could do it, hath declared this to be his Will and Pleasure? We are then to consider, that this being a Point of so great Consequence, the Commission for such a Court of Judicature in the Church ought to be delivered in the plainest and clearest Words that may be; for otherwise this were to beget Controversies instead of putting an end to them. When God under the Law, established a Supreme Court of Appeal as to the Differences which might arise about the Law, he tells them where that Court should sit, and commands the People to go up thither and hear their Sentence and submit to it. This was a plain and clear Declaration of the Will of God; and they had no more to do but to go up to the Place which God did chuse, *viz. Jerusalem.* And there was never any dispute afterwards among the *Israelites* what they were to do when Differences happened; for an Appeal lay to the Court of *Jerusalem*, and the Sentence of that Court they were to stand to on pain of Death. Our blessed Saviour knew this Constitution among the *Jews*, when he founded his Church; and if he had intended any such Thing therein, he would not have fallen short of the exactness of the Law in the Things necessary in order to the Establishment of it; *i. e.* he would not have failed to have told us, who were to make up that Supreme Court, and where it was to Sit. For these Things were necessary to the end of it. Shall we then say, that Christ was not yet resolved where it should be? Or, that it was not fit to let it be known so soon? But why not, when he made Promises to the Apostles of *being with them to the end of the World?* There can be no pretence, why he should not then declare, where the Supreme and standing Court of his Church was to be; which was in all Ages to give Rules to the rest of the Church, and to Determine all Points of Faith which came before them.

Deut. 17, 8, 9, 10, 11.

But did the Apostles Determine this Matter after Christ's Ascension? If they had done it, we must have yielded, because they had an Infallible Spirit: But we find nothing like it in all their Writings. They mention *Heresies* often, and *damnable* ones they saw *creeping into the Church*, they lamented the Schisms and Divisions in the Churches of their own Planting, and used frequent and vehement Exhortations to Peace and Unity. But why not a word of the Infallible Judge of Controversies all this while? S. *Paul* wrote to the Church of *Rome* it self, and even there mentions *Dissensions that were among them*, as well as in any other Church. What, could not he tell them they were to make Rules and give Judgment for the whole Church? Did S. *Paul* envy this Privilege to S. *Peter*'s See, and therefore took no notice of it? That I suppose will not be said of him, though he once *withstood him to the face.* But, how happen the rest of the Apostles not to do it? Nay, how came S. *Peter* himself, writing for the Benefit of the whole Church, in a *Catholick Epistle*, never to give the least Intimation concerning it? These Things make it appear incredible to me, that Christ or his Apostles appointed any such thing; especially, when the Apostles in their infallible Writings give such Directions to particular Christians as they do; *to prove all things, and to hold fast that which is good; to try the Spirits whether they be of God or not.* What had they to do *to try the Spirits*, or *to prove any thing themselves*, if the Judgment of the Matters of Faith were so given to the Church, that others without farther enquiry are bound to submit to its Sentence? And if Christ and his Apostles knew

Rom. 16. 17.

1 Thess. 5. 21.

1 S. John 4. 1.

nothing

nothing of such an Infallible Judge; we have no Reason to hearken to any, who after their time should pretend to it. For the Promise of Infallibility must be made by him; and such a Commission can be derived only from the immediate Authority of Christ himself.

But the *Defender* saith, *The Holy Scripture assures us that the Church is the Foundation and Pillar of Truth.* I confess, I cannot be assured from hence, that the Church hath such an Authority as is here pleaded for, suppose it be understood of the whole Church. For how was it possible the Church at that time should be *the Foundation and Pillar of Truth*, when the Apostles had the Infallible Spirit, and were to guide and direct the whole Church? It seems therefore far more probable to me, that those Words relate to *Timothy*, and not to the Church, by a very common *Ellipsis*, viz. *How he ought to behave himself in the Church of God, which is the House of the living God, as a Pillar and Support of Truth:* And to that Purpose this whole Epistle was written to him; as appears by the beginning of it, wherein he is charged *not to give heed to Fables, and to take care that no false Doctrine were taught at* Ephesus. Now, saith the Apostle, *If I come not shortly, yet I have written this Epistle, that thou mayst know how to behave thy self in the Church, which is the House of God, as a Pillar and Support of Truth.* What can be more natural and easie, than this Sense? And that there is no Novelty in it appears from hence, that *Gregory Nyssen* expresly delivers this to be the meaning; and many others of the Fathers apply the same Phrases to the great Men of the Church. S. *Basil* useth the very same Expressions concerning *Musonius*. S. *Chrysostom* calls the Apostles *the immoveable Pillars of the true Faith.* *Theodoret* saith concerning S. *Peter* and S. *John*, *That they were the Towers of Godliness, and the Pillars of Truth.* *Gregory Nazianzen* calls S. *Basil*, *The Ground of Faith, and the Rule of Truth:* And elsewhere, *The Pillar and Ground of the Church*; which Titles he gives to another Bishop at that time. And so it appears in the *Greek Catena*, mentioned by *Heinsius*, S. *Basil* read these Words or understood them so; when he saith, *The Apostles were the Pillars of the* New Jerusalem, *as it is said, The Pillar and Ground of the Church.* I forbear more, since these are sufficient to shew that they understood this Place as relating to *Timothy*, and not to the *Church.*

1 Tim. 3. 15.

*Greg. Nyssen de vita Mos. p. 226.*
*Basil. Epist. 62.*
*Chrysost. Hom. 148. To. 5.*
*Theod. de Prov. Orat. 10. p. 441.*
*Greg. Nazian. Ep. 38. Orat. 19. Epist. 9.*
*Heins. in loc.*

As to what he brings of *Scriptures not being of private Interpretation*; It is so remote from the Sense and Scope of the Place, which relates wholly to *Divine Inspiration*, that this is a great Instance of that *private Interpretation* which ought to be avoided, *viz.* of minding only the Words, without regard to the Sense of Scripture.

Pag. 17.

It was said in the Papers, *That Christ left his Power to his Church, even to forgive Sins in Heaven; and left his Spirit with them, which they exercised after the Resurrection.*

It was farther answered, That all this makes nothing for the *Roman Catholick Church* not then in being, unless she were Heir-General to the Apostles; that the ordinary Power of the Keys relates not to this Matter; that the Promise of the Spirit, made to the Apostles, implied many Gifts not pretended to by this Heir-General, as the Gift of Tongues, Spirit of Discerning, Prophecy, miraculous Cures and Punishments. If no more be understood of Divine Assistance, that is promised as much to keep Men from Sin as Error; but the Church of *Rome* pretends only to the latter; and yet it is granted too, that it may err in Matters of great Consequence to the Peace of the Christian World, as in the Deposing Doctrine. This

is

is the Substance of the Answer; let us now see what they Reply.

*Def.* p. 33. The force of what the *Defender* saith is this, *That though the* Roman Church *were not then in being, yet as soon as it was, it was a part of the* Catholick Church, *to which the Promises were made; and therefore the* Roman Catholick *Church being the One Church of Christ, these Promises must have their Effect in her.*

This is all I can make of it; though it cost me more pains to lay their Things together with an appearance of Strength, than to give an Answer to them.

The *Roman* Church it seems had not the Promises made to it; *but as soon as it was a Church, she was a Part of the* Catholick Church. This is very intelligible. Let us then go on. But how come the Promises made to the *Catholick Church* to belong to the *Roman Catholick*? How comes the *Roman Catholick* to be the *One Church of Christ on Earth?* But this is running forwards and backwards. And no good is to be done, without supposing *Roman* and *Catholick* to be Terms equivalent.

Pag. 33. He tells me, *I am over-hasty in removing the Power of working Miracles out of the Church. For,* he saith, *God still works Miracles in the* Roman *Church; and if I would put the whole Issue on Miracles, he would undertake the Proof.*

There is nothing in this Case like working of Miracles among us, for our Satisfaction. For Miracles *are a Sign to Unbelievers.* But it is a pleasant Thing, that they should go about to convince us by those Things, which they laugh at one another for pretending to. I will give them an Instance past contradiction. Did not the *Jansenists* pretend to a Miracle at *Port-Royal* by one of the Thorns of our Saviour's Crown? And did not the *Jesuits* expose the very Pretence as idle and ridiculous? As appears by *F. Annat*'s Book on that Occasion. The late Author of *the Prejudices against the* Jansenists, upon occasion of that Miracle, lays down some good Rules for discerning true Miracles and false. (1.) That such Miracles are not sufficient to convince, which may be effected by a created Power, unless they be attested by such Miracles which can only be effected by a Divine Power; such as Resurrection from the dead. (2.) We must not only attend to the Nature, but to the End of Miracles; which, he saith, is the true Worship of God, and the Love of Vertue. And by these Rules I shall be content to examine all his Miracles, when ever he produces them.

*Prefugâs legit. c. le Jansenists, c.* 10.

Pag. 87.

*The Assistance which Christ promised,* he tells us, *was to all his Doctrine, and to all time.*

But what a sad Thing is it, that we have nothing but his bare saying for the Proof of it! Never Man more needed Infallibility than this *Defender* does, when he undertakes to prove it. What! Can Christ afford no Assistance to his Church without Infallibility? What thinks he of the Assistance of Divine Grace? Doth that make all Infallible that have it: And is not that Assistance by virtue of Divine Promises? *Is this to ask which of the Parts of his Promise he will not perform?* We doubt not he will perform all he hath promised, but we desire to see where he hath made the Promise. We ask nothing unreasonable, and therefore out of pity to our Weakness, shew these Promises of standing Infallibility to us; and do not take it still for granted without proving it.

*Rep.* p. 23. But the *Replier* saith, *The Promises of Christ imply whatever is necessary to the Church for the Support and Government of her self to the Worlds end.*

Is Infallibility then necessary for the Support and Government of the

*Catholick*

*Catholick Church*? If not, then the Promiſes of *Support* and *Government* relate not to the Matter. But no leſs a Man than S. *Auguſtine*, frequently affirms, *That the Promiſes made by Chriſt to the Church, are only made to good and not to bad Men in it; and that the caſe of wicked Men in the Church, and of Hereticks and Schiſmaticks out of it is alike*; i. e. that both have true Sacraments, but neither any right to the Promiſes. And this he doth not aſſert by chance, but it is the very Foundation of his Anſwer to the *Donatiſts*, in the Anſwer which himſelf valued the moſt. *Aug. de Bapt. c. Donatiſt. l. 3. c. 17, 18. l. 4. c. 18, 20. l. 5. c. 21. l. 6. c. 1, 3, 4, 14, 24, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 40.*

And he concludes with ſaying, *That ſome are in the Houſe of God, ſo as to be that Houſe of God which was built upon a Rock, and had the Promiſes made to it; and theſe are the Saints diſperſed over the World and joyned together in the Communion of the ſame Sacraments; others are ſo in the Houſe, as not to belong to the Frame of it; but are as the Chaff among the Wheat; and are rather of the Houſe than any part of it.* If this be good Doctrine in S. *Auguſtin*, what becomes of all the Promiſes made to the Church, with reſpect to the External Government and Support of it? *l. 7. c. 12, 32, 43, 44. L. 2, c. 1. L. 7. c. 51. L. 5. c. 3, 11, 16, 18, 9, 20, 24. l. 6. c. 28, 29. l. 7. c. 6, 7, 10, 37.*

I might name Multitudes of Places more, wherein he argues, *That wicked Men do not belong to the One Church; and are not the Spouſe of Chriſt*: For Chriſt ſaith to them, *I know you not; and Hereticks*, he ſaith, *are but one ſort of bad Men.* If therefore the Promiſes of the *Catholick Church* do not belong to one, neither can they to the other.

I had therefore Reaſon to ask, where God hath ever promiſed to keep Men more from Error than Sin? And how it comes to paſs that very bad Men are allow'd in the Church of *Rome* to have this Promiſe of Infallibility?

The *Defender* ſlides off from this to a Matter he was better prepared to Anſwer. But the *Replier* tells us of *ſome of the Prophets who were great Sinners*; I ſuppoſe he means *Balaam* and *Caiaphas*. But however, this doth not reach to the Matter of the *New Teſtament*, wherein *doing the Will of of God* is laid down as the beſt *Means of knowing the Truth*. But he offers at a Reaſon *why Impeccability is not ſo neceſſary as Infallibility, becauſe without this the Church could not ſubſiſt; for if once ſhe make Shipwrack of her Faith, ſhe is no more a Church, an Effect not ſo proper to Sin.* There is a great Difference between *abſolute Impeccability* and *notorious Offenders*; the Queſtion I put was not concerning perfect Saints, but great Sinners; why they ſhould believe that Chriſt would give an infallible Aſſiſtance to keep ſuch Men from erring, when notwithſtanding the Aſſiſtance of Grace, they run on in a Courſe of Wickedneſs? He ſaith, *One is neceſſary for the Church, and not the other.* Then there may be a Holy Catholick infallible Church made up of none but great Sinners. And was this ſuch a Church as *Chriſt purchaſed with his own Blood; and whom he redeemed from all Impiety to be a peculiar People, zealous of good Works*: If they ſay, *The Grace of God will never fail to keep ſome from great Sins*; why may not the ſame hold as to great Errors? And that be as much as the Promiſes extend to. *Rep.* p. 23. John 7. 17.

*But if the Church once makes Shipwrack of Faith, ſhe is no more a Church.*

How comes *Faith* to be ſeparated from a *good Conſcience*? I am ſure S. *Paul* joyns them together. Is no Error conſiſtent with the Being of a Church? Not an Error about the *Seat* of *Infallibility*? Not an Error about the *Immaculate Conception*? Nor about the *Viſion of God before the Day of Judgment*? Not about the Son's being of the ſame Subſtance with the Father? Not about Chriſt's having a Will proper to his humane Nature? Then there can be no ſuch Thing as the Roman Catholick Church in the Opinion of thoſe who are for perſonal Infallibility of the Pope, ſince the Head;

Heads of their Church have erred about theſe Things. The true Church can never make Shipwrack of that Faith which makes her a true Church: But other kind of Errors cannot overthrow her Being.

I urged farther, That notwithſtanding the Pretence to Infallibility, they allow the Church may err in Matters of Practice of the higheſt Importance, as about Depoſing Princes and Abſolving Subjects from their Allegiance; but not about the leaſt Matter of Faith; which made it very ſuſpicious to be rather a Politick Device than a Thing they really believed.

*Def.* p. 34, 35. Here the *Defender* (I fear wilfully) miſtakes my Meaning; for he argues as if he thought I were proving, *That the Church* of Rome *hath defined the Depoſing Doctrine as a Matter of Faith*; and great Pains he takes to prove it hath not. And all to no Purpoſe. For I inſiſted only, that in this Point, they confeſſed their Church had *groſly erred as to a Matter of Practice*, though it had not expreſly declared it as an Article of Faith. I deſire him to ſpeak out; hath it not erred notoriouſly as to Practice in this Matter? Whether they have made any ſuch Declaration or not, as to oblige all others of their Communion to embrace the Doctrine; it is undeniably true, that their Popes and Councils have owned it and acted according to it, to the mighty Diſturbance of the Peace of the Chriſtian World. Now the Queſtion I put was this, Since it is granted they have ſo notoriouſly erred in Matters of Practice, why ſhould any believe them Infallible in Points of Faith? *i. e.* That ſo many Popes, ſo many Councils, ſhould act upon this Principle, as believing it to be true, and yet preſerve their Infallibility in not declaring it to be true. This I confeſs is an extraordinary Thing; and the *Defender* ſeems in earneſt to think they were kept from it *by an over-ruling Aſſiſtance of the Divine Spirit.* Which is juſt as if a Man were ſet upon in the Road by ſome pretending to be his Friends, who ſhould take from him all that he had, and afterwards he ſhould admire the Providence of God, that theſe Men ſhould not declare it lawful to do it. It is granted that ſo many Popes did great Miſchief to the World, and eſpecially to Chriſtian Princes, by acting according to this Doctrine, and that they actually owned it in Councils, and made Canons on Purpoſe for it, but yet an *over-ruling Aſſiſtance kept them from making it a Point of Faith.* They declaring their own Belief by their Practice and Canons; they required the Obſervance of them under Pain of being cut off from the Church if they did it not; and *Gregory* VII. ſaith,

*Greg.* 7. *Epiſt.* *Reg. l.* 4. *Ep.* 2. *They cut themſelves off who queſtion this Power*? but they were deceived, notoriouſly deceived in this Matter, yet they might be Infallible ſtill. Did not theſe Popes declare that to be Chriſt's Doctrine which is not? *But not Authoritatively.* What I pray doth this Mean? Did they not declare this Power by Vertue of the Authority given them by Chriſt over the Church? And declare thoſe Excommunicate who did not obey their Sentence? Is not this proceeding *Authoritatively*? Suppoſe the Popes had in the ſame manner declared that Hereticks ſhould be Re-baptized, *i. e.* made Canons for it, and required the Obſervance of them; I deſire to know whether this had not been *Authoritative declaring* it, though they affixed no *Anathema* to thoſe who held the contrary? Is it poſſible for any Man to believe, that if there were ſuch a thing as Infallibility in the Guides of the Church, that Chriſt would ſuffer them to run into ſuch pernicious Errors, and in ſuch an *Authoritative Manner*, and yet make good his Promiſe of keeping them from Error, by not ſuffering them to define this Doctrine as an Article of Faith? But this will appear to be a very ſlender Evaſion, if Men will reflect on the Nature of the Matter it ſelf; for it is about the

Exerciſe

exercise of the Pope's Power over Princes; and can it be supposed that since they challenged it, they would ever suffer it to be debated in Councils; but they would still have it pass as an inseparable Right of their Supremacy derived from S. *Peter*. And all that they would allow in this Case, is a bare Recognition; and that was made in the Councils of *Lyons* and *Lateran*.

And the Deposing Power in the Church, was sufficiently owned in the Councils of *Constance* and *Trent*.

But there are two sorts of Articles of Faith to be considered in the Church of *Rome*.

1. Some are defined with an *Anathema* against Dissenters; and so we do not say the Deposing Power is made an Article of Faith.

2. Some are received upon the common Grounds of Faith, though not expressly declared. And whatever Doctrine being denied would overthrow them, may be justly look'd on as a Presumptive Article of Faith. As the denying the Deposing Power must charge the Church of *Rome* Representative and Virtual with such Acts, as are utterly inconsistent with the Promises of Divine Assistance supposed to be made to it. Therefore all those who sincerely believe those Promises to belong to the Church of *Rome* so taken, must in Consequence believe so many Popes and Councils could not be so grosly mistaken in the Ground of their Actings. And I find those who do now most contend that this Doctrine was never defined, do yet yield, that both Popes and Councils believed it to be true, and acted accordingly.

But if nothing will be allowed to be Points of Faith, but what passes under the Decision of Councils approved by the Pope as such, I pray tell me, which of the General Councils determined the Pope's Supremacy as a Point of Faith? Where was the *Roman Catholick* Churches Infallibility defined? Are these Points of Faith with you, or not? If they be, then there may be Points of Faith among you which never passed any Conciliar Definitions; or such Authoritative Declaration as the *Defender* means.

(2.) I now come to consider the Sense of the Primitive Church about this matter of an Infallible Judge of Controversies. Which I am obliged to do, not only because it is said in the Papers, *That the Church exercised this Power after the Apostles*; but because the *Defender* brings *Tertullian* as *rejecting the Scripture from being a sufficient Rule for Controversies; and S.* Augustine, *as setting up the Authority of the Church above the Scripture in Matters of Proof.* Pag. 18.

But I confess two lame Sayings of Fathers make no great Impression on me. I am for searching the Sense of the Primitive Church in so weighty a Point as this, after another manner; (but as briefly as may be) *i. e.* by the general Sense of the Fathers of the first Ages about the *Controversies* then on foot, that I may not deceive my self or others in a matter of this Consequence.

The Point is, Whether according to the Sense of the Primitive Church, when any Controversie about Faith doth arise, a Person be bound to submit to the Churches Sentence as Infallible; or he be required to make use of the best Means he can to judge concerning it, taking the Scriptures for his Infallible Rule?

Now to judge the Sense of the Primitive Church about this Point, there can be no Method more proper or convincing than to consider what Course the Christian Church did take in the Controversies then started, which were great and considerable. And if it had been then believed that Christ

had left such an infallible Authority in the Church to have put an end to them; it had been no more possible to have avoided the mention of it, than if a great Cause in Law were to be decided among us, that neither Party should ever take notice of the *Judges* in *Westminster-Hall*.

There were two very great Controversies in the Primitive Church, which continued a long time under different Names; and we are now to observe what Method the Catholick Writers of the Church took for establishing the true Faith.

And these were concerning *the Humanity, and the Divinity of Christ.*

1 John 4. 3. That concerning the *Humanity* of Christ begun very early; for S. *John* mentions *those who denied that Jesus was come in the Flesh*; i. e. that he really took our Nature upon him. And this Heresie did spread very much after the Apostles Times.

*Ignatius* made it a great Part of the Business of his Epistles to warn the Churches he wrote to, and to arm them against it. And what way doth he take to do it? Doth he ever tell them of the Danger of using their own Judgment; or of not relying on the Authority of the Church in this Matter? I cannot find one Passage tending that way in all his Epistles. But instead thereof, he appeals to the Words of our Saviour in the Evangelist, *Touch me, and see if I be a Body, or a Spirit:* His words are *an incorporeal Dæmon*; but it was usual with the ancient Fathers to repeat the Sense of Places, and not the very Words. And a little after he saith, *That these Hereticks were not perswaded, neither by the Prophets, nor by the Law, nor by the Gospel.* And he advises the Church of *Smyrna to attend to the Prophets, but especially to the Gospel; in which the Passion and Resurrection of Christ are declared.*

*Ad Smyrn. p.* 3.

Pag. 4.

Pag. 6.

*Iren. l.* 3. *c.* 17, 18. *Irenæus* disputes warmly and frequently against this *Heresie*; and he appeals to the Testimony of the Apostles in their Writings; especially to the *Gospels* of S. *John* and S. *Matthew*; but not omitting the other *Gospels* and the *Epistles* of S. *Paul* and S. *John*. And he calls *the Scriptures*, *The* * *immoveable Rule of Truth*; *the* † *Foundation and Pillar of our Faith*; and saith, *That* * *they contain the whole Will of God.* It is true, he makes use of *Tradition* in the Church, to those who rejected *the Scriptures*; and he finds fault with those who took Words and Pieces of *Scripture* to serve their turn; but he directs to the right use of it, and doth not seem to question *the sufficiency* thereof, for the Satisfaction of humble and teachable Minds in all the Points of Faith, which were then controverted.

* *L.* 1. 1. 4. 69.
† *L.* 3. *c.* 1.
* *L.* 2. 47. 4. 66.

*Tertullian* undertakes the same Cause in several Books and several ways. One is by shewing that the Opinion of the Hereticks was novel; not being consistent with the Doctrine delivered by the Apostles, as appeared by the unanimous Consent of the Apostolical Churches; which did all believe Christ had a true and real Body. And this way he made use of, because those Hereticks either rejected, or interpolated, or perverted the Books of Scripture. But this way of *Prescription* look'd like *Out-Lawing* of *Hereticks* and never suffering them to come to a fair Trial. Therefore in his other Books he goes upon three substantial Grounds. (1.) *That the Books of Scripture do certainly deliver the Doctrine of the Christian Church concerning Christ's having a true Body.* (2.) *That these Books of Scripture were not counterfeit, nor corrupted and adulterated; but preserved genuine and sincere in the Apostolical Churches.* (3.) *That the Sense which the Hereticks put upon the Words of Scripture was forced and unreasonable; but the sence of the Church was true and natural.* So that *Tertullian* did conclude, that there was no way to end this Controversie but by finding out the true Sense of Scripture.

*De Carne Christi, & c. Marcion. & c. Valentin.*

But

But the Author of the *Defence* brings in *Tertullian*, *as representing all Trial of Doctrine by Scripture, as good for nothing but to turn the Brain or the Stomach; and that the Issue is either uncertain or none.* Def. p. 18. De Præscript. c. 17.

I grant *Tertullian* hath those Words; but for Truth sake I wish he had not left out others, *viz That those Hereticks do not receive some Scriptures; and those they do receive they add and alter as they please. And what*, saith he, *can the most skilful in Scriptures do with those who will defend or deny what they think fit? With such indeed*, he saith, *it is to little Purpose to dispute out of Scriptures.* And no doubt he was in the Right; for the Rule must be allow'd on both Sides; or else there can be nothing but a wrangling about it. The first thing then here, was to settle the Rule, and for this the Testimony of the Apostolical Churches was of great Use. But to imagine that *Tertullian* rejected all Tryal of Doctrines by *Scripture*, is to make him to write to little Purpose afterwards; when he combates with all sorts of Hereticks out of *Scripture*, as appears by his Books against *Marcion*, *Praxeas*, *Hermogenes* and others. And *Tertullian* himself saith, *That if we bring Hereticks only to Scripture, they cannot stand.* Not because they went only upon Reason; but in the end of the same Treatise he saith, *They made use of Scriptures too, but such as were to be confuted by other Scriptures.* And therefore he makes the Hereticks *to decline*, as much as in them lay, *the Light of the Scriptures*, which he would never have charged on others, if he thought himself that Controversies could not be ended by them.

Auser denique Hæreticis quæ cum Ethnicis sapiunt, ut de Scripturis solis quæstiones suas sistant, & stare non poterunt. De Resur. Carnis. c. 3.

Hæreses autem sine aliquibus occasionibus Scripturarum audire non poterant; idcirco pristina instrumenta quasdam materias illis videntur subministrasse, & ipsas quidem iisdem literis revincibiles. c. 63.

Lucifugæ isti Scripturarum, c. 47.

*Clemens Alexandrinus* speaking of the same Heresies, makes the Controversie to consist chiefly *about the Scriptures*, whether they were to be embraced and followed, or not. He saith, *None of the Heresies among Christians had so darken'd the Truth, but that those who would might find it; and the Way* he advises to, *is a diligent search of the Scriptures; wherein the Demonstration of our Faith doth consist; and by which, as by a certain Criterion, we are to judge of the Truth and Falshood of Opinions.* Which he there insists upon at large. He speaks indeed of the Advantage of the Church above Heresies, both as to *Antiquity* and *Unity*; but he never makes the *Judgment* of the *Church* to be the *Rule of Faith*, as he doth the *Scriptures*. Clem. Alex. Strom. l. 7. p. 755. Οὐ σφέτερον ἀποσήσονται ζητοῦντες τὴν Ἀλήθειαν, πεῖν ἂν τὴν ἀπόδειξιν ἀπ' αὐτῶν λαβόντα τῶν γραφῶν. ib. & 757.

In the *Dialogue* against the *Marcionists*, supposed to be *Origen's*, this Controversie is briefly handled, the Point is brought to the *Sense* of *Scripture*; as in that Place, *the Word was made Flesh*; from which, and other Places the Catholick argues the *Truth of Christ's Humane Nature*; especially from Christ's appealing to the Sense of his Disciples about the Truth of his Body after the Resurrection. All his *Demonstrations* are out of *Scripture*, and by the meer Force of them he overthrows this Heresie. And it was nothing but the clear Evidence of *Scripture*, without any Infallible Judgment or Assistance of the Guides of the Church, which did at last suppress this Heresie. For no Council was called about it, but as the Authority of the *New Testament* prevailed, so this Heresie declined, and by Degrees vanished out of the Christian World. And it is observable, That the greatest and worst of Heresies were suppress, while no other Authority was made use of against them but that of the Holy Scriptures. So *Theodoret* takes notice, *That before his Time these Heresies by Divine Grace were extinct.* So that the Scriptures were then found an effectual Means for putting an end to some of the most dangerous Heresies which ever were in the Christian Church. Orig. Dial. c. Marcionist. §. 4. p. 108. p. 101. Theod. ad hær. fab. Præf. & l. 2. p. 218.

The other great Controversie of the first Age, was about *the Divinity of Christ*; which begun with the *Ebionites* and *Cerinthians*, and was continued down by Succession, as appears by *Theodoret*'s Account of Heresies in his second Book. Those who first embraced this Heresie rejected the whole *New Testament*, and received only the *Nazarene Gospel*. But after a while *Artemon* had the Boldness to assert that the Apostles deliver'd the same Doctrine in their *Writings*, and then the Controversie was reduced to the *Sense of Scripture*. *Paulus Samosatenus* follow'd *Artemon*, as *Photinus* afterwards follow'd him. But *Theodoret* again observes, *That all those Heresies against the Divinity of Christ were in his time so extinct, that not so much as any Remainders of them were left*; but saith he, *The true Doctrines of the Gospels prevail and spread themselves over the World.* And we may find what Course was taken for putting an end to this Controversie, by the Management of it with *Paulus Samosatenus*. In the Fragment of an Epistle of *Dionysius* of *Alexandria*, we read the *Testimonies of Scripture* which he produced against him; and more at large in the *Epistle* of the *Six Bishops to him*; who makes use of the very same *Places* of *Scripture* which are most applied to that Purpose to this Day. To which they only add, *That this had been the Doctrine of the Christian Church from the beginning; and all* Catholick Churches *agreed in it.* But here is no such thing thought of as *Infallibility* in the *Guides of the Church*; for there is great difference between the Consent of the Christian Church, as a Means to find out the Sense of Scripture, and the Authority of Church Guides declaring the Sense by Vertue of an Infallible Assistance; the one is but a Moral Argument, and the other is a Foundation of Faith.

Hæret. Fab. l. 3. p. 226, 231. *Theodoret* further observes, *That there was another set of Heresies distinct from the two former in the Primitive Church, which related chiefly to Matters of Discipline and Manners; and most of these*, he saith, *were so far destroyed, that there were none then left, who were Followers of* Nicolas, Nepos, *or* Patroclus, *and very few* Novatians, *or* Montanists, *or* Quartodecimans; *so that Truth had prevailed over the World*, and the Heresies *were either quite rooted out, or only some dry and withered Branches remained of them in remote and obscure Places.*

Which being affirmed by a Person of so much Judgment and Learning, as *Theodoret* was, gives us a plain and evident Proof, that the *Sense* of *Scripture* may be so fully clear'd, without an *Infallible Church*, as to be effectual for putting an end to Controversies.

And altho' we own a great Esteem and Reverence for the Four *General Councils*; yet we cannot but observe, that Controversies were so far from being ended by them, that they broke out more violently after them. As the *Arian* Controversie after the Council of *Nice*; the *Nestorian* after that at *Ephesus*; and these Gentlemen believe that Heresie continues still in the *East*: The *Eutychian* Controversie gave greater Disturbance after the Council of *Chalcedon*, than before, and continued so to do for many Ages: Which is an Argument that the Infallibility of Councils, or of the Guides of the Church, was not a Doctrine then received in the Church.

But I proceed to shew what Means were used in the Primitive Church for putting an end to Controversies. Of which we have a remarkable Instance in the Dispute about *Rebaptizing Hereticks*. This was managed between S. *Cyprian* and other Bishops of *Africa* and *Asia*, on one side, and *the Bishop* of *Rome* on the other. He pleaded *Custom* and *Tradition*: The other, *That Custom without Truth was but Ancient Error; and that the Matter ought to be examined by Scripture*; and many Reasons they bring from thence; because Christ said in his Gospel, *I am Truth; and the only way*

S. Cyprian. Epist. 74, 75.

*to*

*to prevent Errors, is to have Recourse to the Head and Fountain of Divine Tradition*, i. e. *to the Holy Scriptures*; which S. *Cyprian* calls the *Evangelical and Apostolical Tradition*. So that we have the clear Opinion of the *African Bishops*, that this Controversie ought to be decided by Scripture. But here the Replier saith, *That Right stood for the Bishops of* Rome, *and a General Council determined the Point, and the whole Church came to an Acquiescence*. If the Council was in the Right, the Bishop of *Rome* was not; if St. *Cyprian* represent his Opinion truly, and he saith he did it in his own Words, which are, *Si quis à quacunque Hæresi venerit ad nos, nihil innovetur nisi quod Traditum est*. Now, no Council ever determin'd so, That whatsoever the Heresy was, none should be Rebaptized. For the Councils of *Arles* and *Nice* both disallow'd the Baptism of some Hereticks; and therefore, if the Council put an end to the Controversie, it was by deciding against the Bishop of *Rome*, as well as S. *Cyprian*. Reply, p. 13.

The *Donatists* afterwards made use of S. *Cyprian*'s Authority in this Controversy, which gave occasion to S. *Augustine*, to deliver that noted Sentence, concerning *Scripture* and *Fathers*, and *Councils*, viz. *That Canonical Scripture is to be preferr'd before any other Writings, for they are to be believed without Examination; but the Writings of Bishops are to be examined and corrected by other Bishops and Councils, if they see Cause; and lesser Councils by greater, and the greatest Councils, by such as come after them, when Truth comes to be more fully discovered*. It is hardly possible for a Man to speak plainer against a standing infallible Judge in Controversies, than S. *Augustine* doth in these Words, wherein he neither limits his Words to Matters of Fact, nor to Manners; but he speaks generally, as to the Authority of the Guides of the Church compared with *Scripture*. Which are enter'd in the Authentick Body of the Canon Law, approved and corrected at *Rome*, only that part which relates to the correcting of Councils, is left out. But to make amends, *Gratian* in another Place, hath with admirable Ingenuity, put the *Pope's Decretal Epistles* among the *Canonical Scriptures*, and quotes S. *Augustine* for it too. But the *Roman Correctors* were ashamed of so gross a Forgery, and confess S. *Augustine* never thought of the *Decretal Epistles*, but of the *Canonical Scriptures*; but yet they let the Title stand for good Canon Law. Aug. de Bapt. c. Donatist. l. 2. c. 3. Decr. Dist. 9. c. 8. Dist. 19. c. 6.

In the Controversy about the Church with the *Donatists*, S. *Augustine*'s constant appeal is to the *Scriptures*; and he sets aside, not only particular *Doctors*, but the Pretence to *Miracles*, and the *Definitions* of *Councils*. He doth not therefore appeal to Scripture, because they disputed about the Church; but because he looked on the Testimonies of Scripture, as clear enough to decide the Point, as he often declares. And he calls the plain Testimonies of *Scripture*, *the support and strength of their Cause*. If he then thought that that Scripture alone could put an end to such a Controversie as that, no doubt he thought so as to any other. But we need not mention his Thoughts, for he declares as much: Whether it be about Christ or his Church, or any Matter of Faith, he makes Scripture so far the Rule, that he denounces *Anathema against those who deliver any other Doctrine than what is contained in them*. Nor doth he direct to any Church Authority to manifest the *Sense of Scripture*, but leaves all Mankind to judge of it, and even the *Donatists* themselves whom he opposed. The same Way he takes with *Maximinus* the *Arian*, *He desires all other Authorities may be laid aside, and only those of Scripture and Reason used*. To what Purpose, unless he thought the Scripture sufficient to end the Controversie. De unit. Eccl. c. 3. 4 16. c. Petil. Don. l. 3 c. 6. c. Maxim. Arian. l. 3. c. 14.

Against

c. Faust. l. 11. c. 5. Against *Faustus* the *Manichean*, he saith, *The Excellency of the Canonical Scripture is such, as to be placed in a Throne far above all other Writings, to which every faithful and pious Mind ought to submit. All other Writings are to be tried by them; but there is no doubt to be made of whatever we find in them.*

De Peccator. Merit. & remiss. l. 1. 22. De Nuptiis & Concupisc. l. 2. c. 33. The same Method he uses with the *Pelagians*, and advises *them to yield to the Authority of Scripture, which can neither deceive nor be deceived. This Controversie*, saith he, *requires a Judge; let Christ judge, let us hear him speak. Let the Apostle judge with him, for Christ speaks in his Apostle.* And in another place, *Let St.* John *sit judge between us.*

De Grat. & lib. Arbitrio. c. 18. In Psalm 67. And in general he saith, *We ought to acquiesce in the Authority of Scripture; and when any Controversie arises, it ought to be quietly ended by Proofs brought from thence.*

Def. p. 18. But St. *Augustine* is the Man, whom the Defender produces against me; *because against the* Manicheans, he saith, *he believed the Scripture for the sake of the Church; and to bring any proof out of Scripture against the Church, does weaken that Authority, upon which he believed the Scripture, and so he could believe neither.* The meaning whereof is this, S. *Augustine* was reduced from being a *Manichean* to the *Catholick Church* by many Arguments; and by the Authority of the *Church* delivering the Books of *Scripture*, he embraced the Gospel, which before he did not. Now, saith he, *You would make use of this Gospel to prove Manichæus an Apostle, I can by no means yield to this way.* Why so? Do not you believe it to be Gospel? *Yes*, saith he; *but the same reason which moved me to embrace this Gospel, moved me to reject Manichæus, and therefore I have no reason to allow a Testimony out of it for Manichæus.* Not that S. *Augustine* feared any Proof that could be brought from thence; but he begins with general *Topicks*, as *Tertullian* did against the Hereticks of his Time, before he came to close with them. And such was this which he here produces. For in case *Manichæus* his Name had been in the Gospel as an *Apostle of Christ's appointing*, this Argument of S. *Augustine* had not been sufficient. For there might be sufficient Reason from the Churches Authority to embrace the *Gospel*; and yet if the Scripture had been plain, he ought to have believed *Manichæus* his *Apostleship*, though the Church disowned it. As I will prove by an undeniable Instance: Suppose a *Jewish* Proselyte to have argued just after the same manner against *Jesus being the Messias*; the Apostles go about to prove that he was so, by the Testimony of the Prophets: No, saith he, I can allow no such Argument: because the same Authority of the *Jewish* Church, which perswaded me to believe the Prophets, doth likewise perswade me not to believe *Jesus to be the Messias.* If it be so far from holding in this case, neither can it in the other. For it proceeds upon a very feeble Supposition, that no Church can deliver a Book for Canonical, but it must judge aright concerning all things relating to it. Which unavoidably makes the *Jewish Church infallible* at the same time it condemned Christ as a Deceiver. But this was only a witty velitation in S. *Augustine*, used by Rhetoricians, before he entered into the Merits of the Cause. And it is very hard when such Sayings shall at every turn be quoted, against his more mature and well weighed Judgment.

Def. p. 2. What Noise is there made in the World with that one Saying of his, *I should not believe the Gospel, unless the Authority of the Catholick Church moved me?* And the Defender brings it to prove *the Church more visible than Scripture.* Whereas, he means no more by it, but that the Authority of the Church was greater to him, than that of *Manichæus.* For he had been swayed by his Authority to reject the Gospel; and now he rejects that Authority,

thority, and believes the Catholick Church rather than him. And this doth not make the Churches Authority greater than Scripture, but more *visible* than that of *Manichæus*.

But if S. *Augustine*'s Testimony here be allowed to extend farther, yet it implies no more than that the constant, universal Tradition of the Scripture by the Catholick Church, makes it appear credible to us. What can be deduced hence as to the Churches Infallibility in interpreting Scripture, or the *Roman* Churches Authority in delivering it?

The *Arrian* Controversie gave a great Disturbance to the Christian Church; and no less a Man than the Emperor *Constantine* thought *there was no such way to put an end to it, as to search the Scriptures about it*; As he declared to the Council of *Nice* at their Meeting, as *Theodoret* saith. It is true, he spake to the Guides of the Church assembled in Council, but his Words are remarkable, viz. *That the Books of Scripture do plainly instruct us what we are to believe concerning the Diety, if we search them with peaceable Minds.* Methinks *Bellarmine* bestows no great Complement on *Constantine* for this Saying, when he saith, *He was a great Emperour, but no great Doctor.* This had been indeed *sawcy and scurrilous* in others, but it was no doubt *good manners* in him. Theod. l. 1. c. 6. Bellar. de Ver. Dei, l. 4. c. 11.

S. *Hilary* commends his Son *Constantius, because he would have this Controversie ended by the Scriptures; and he desires to be heard by him about the sense of the Scriptures concerning it; which he was ready to shew, not from new Writings, but from God's Word.* Hilar. l. 2. ad Constant.

*Athanasius* seems to question the usefulness of Councils in this matter, *because the Scripture of it self was sufficient to put an end to it.* And elsewhere saith, *That it is plain enough to those who search for Truth.* And in general he asserts *their sufficiency and clearness for the discovery of Truth.* Athanas. de Synodis Tom. 1. p. 873. Tom. 2. p. 197. Tom. 1. c. Grat.

When a Controversie was raised in S. *Basil*'s Time about the *Trinity*, the best Expedient that great Man could think of for putting an end to it, was *to refer it to the Scriptures.* In another place he commends it *as the best way to find out Truth, to be much in the study of the Scriptures; and saith that the Spirit of God did thereby lead to all things useful.* Basil. Epist. 80. Tom. 3. Epist. 1, & 284.

*Epiphanius* was well acquainted with all the Heresies of the Church, and the best Means to suppress them; and certainly he would never have taken such Pains to refute so many Heresies out of *Scripture*, if he had look'd on the *Church* as the *Infallible Judge of Controversies.* For he not only undertakes to give the *Sense* of *Scripture* for the ending of Controversies, but he supposes *all Persons capable of understanding it, that will apply themselves to it.* Which he several times affirms in the Confutation of his last Heresie. Hær. 76 p. 923, 943, 989.

I shall conclude with S. *Chrysostome*, who speaks to this purpose, to a Person so offended at the Sects and Heresies among Christians, that he did not know whom or what to believe: *The Scriptures*, saith he, *are plain and true, and it is an easie matter to judge by them; if a Man agrees with the Scriptures, he is a Christian; if not, he is out of that Roll.* But Men differ about the Sense of Scripture. *What*, saith he, *have ye not a mind and judgment?* And after the answering several other Cavils, he concludes, *Let us submit to the Divine Law, and do what is pleasing to that, and that will bring us to Heaven.* And in another place, *If we study the Scriptures, we shall understand both true Doctrine and a good Life.* And again, *the Scriptures are the Door which keep out Hereticks, which establish our Minds in the Truth, and suffer us not to be seduced.* Chrysost. in Acta Apost. Hom. 33. In Joh. Hom. 53. Ib. Hom. 58.

Thus I have given somewhat a clearer view of the *sense* of the *Primitive Church* in this Matter, than could be taken from two single Passages of

of *Tertullian* and S. *Augustine*; and I have been so far from swelling or enlarging this as far as I could, that I have made choice only of these, out of many others which I could have produced. But if these be not sufficient, a Volume will not satisfie; which it were not hard to make on this Subject, out of the Fathers.

(3) It is time now to examine the *Inconveniencies* alledged against Persons judging of Matters of Faith according to the Scriptures.

(1) *That God Almighty would then leave us at Uncertainties, if he gave us a Rule, and left every one to be his own Judge; for that were to leave every phantastical Man to chuse as he pleases.*

To this was answered, (1) That this Objection doth not reach those of the *Church* of *England*, which receives the Three Creeds, and embraces the Four General Councils, and professes to hold nothing contrary to any Universal Tradition of the Church from the Apostles Times: And that we have often offer'd to put the Controversies between us and the Church of *Rome* upon that issue.

Reply, p. 18. To this Answer the Replier saith, *That they do not charge our Church with not professing these things, but for erring against her own Profession, and deserting that Church to which all these Authorities bear Testimony, and of which her Progenitors and first Reformers had been Members, and from whose Hands she received whatsoever she had, either of Scripture, Creeds, Councils or Tradition, and consequently whose judgment she was bound to follow.*

Whether we act against our Profession or not, it is plain the *Rule* of our Church doth not by this Profession *leave every one to follow his own fancy, and to believe as he pleases.* But wherein is it that we thus *Act* against our *Profession*? Do we reject the Creeds, Councils, and Universal Tradition in our Deeds? Wherein? In deserting the Communion of the Church of *Rome*? And is the necessity of that contained in the *Creeds* here receiv'd? In the Four Councils? By Universal Tradition? For this I refer to the foregoing Discourse about the *Unity* of the *Catholick Church*. *But we receiv'd these things from the Church of Rome.* So we do the *Old Testament* from the *Jews*, must we therefore hold Communion still with them? Are we bound therefore to follow the Judgment of the *Jewish Church*? But I do not understand how we receiv'd these Things from the Authority of the Church of *Rome*. We receiv'd the *Scriptures* from *Universal Tradition* derived from all the Apostolical Churches; and so the Creeds and Councils; and such an Universal Tradition is the Thing we desire; for the *Trent-Creed*, our forefathers never knew or receiv'd as part of that Faith without which there is no Salvation.

Def p. 21. But here the Defender grows brisk, and saith, *All Hereticks since the first Four General Councils, may say the very same which I say for the Church of* England; *and all before them the Equivalent.* Arius, Macedonius, Nestorius, *and* Eutyches, *might have said as much of the* Creeds *before them; and all complain of the Villainous Factions in the Church against them. My Plea for the Church of* England *hath justified them all.* [The same thing is

Reply, p. 19. said in fewer Words by the Replier.] *That this Plea justifies the* Arrians, *and condemns the* Nicene *Fathers, vindicates the* Eutychians, Nestorians, *and* Donatists, *and confounds all General Councils.*

Lest therefore I should seem to betray the Church of *England*, instead of defending it, I shall shew the *Reasonableness* and *Equity* of this Plea, and its great Difference from that of the *Ancient Hereticks* condemned by General Councils, or the ancient Church.

(1) The *Ancient Hereticks* were condemned by that *Rule of Faith* which the Church always receiv'd, *viz. the Scriptures*; but the Council of *Trent* set up a new Rule of Faith on purpose that they might condemn us for

for Hereticks, *viz.* in making *Tradition equal with Scripture*, which is directly contrary to the Doctrine of the Primitive Church; as I have already shewed. The Method of General Councils was to have the Books of Scripture placed in the middle of them on a Table, as the Rule they were to judge by. And *Richerius*, a Doctor of the *Sorbon*, not only affirms the Custom, but saith it was for that Reason, *That the Fathers of the Councils might be admonished, that all things were to be examined by the Standard of the Gospel.* Act. Synodi Eph. p. 175. Hist. Concil. To. 1. p. 498.

*Bellarmin* affirms the Council of *Nice*, *To have drawn its Conclusion out of Scriptures*; and the same he affirms of the 6th *General Council*; and he might as well have done it of the rest; their main Design, being only to establish the Doctrine of the Divinity and Incarnation of Christ. But the Case of Councils came to be very different, when they took upon them to define other Matters for which they had no Colour in Scripture (as the 2d Council of *Nice* did, which was the first that went upon Tradition) and then the Christian Church did not shew such Respect to them; as was most apparent in the Case of this Council of *Nice*, which was universally rejected in these *Western* Parts, (*Rome* excepted) as appears by the Council of *Frankford*, and the unexceptionable Testimonies of *Eghinardus*, *Hincmarus*, and others. Would this have been a sufficient Argument against *Charlemaign* and the *Western* Bishops, that they joyned in the Plea of the *Ancient Hereticks*, and none were ever condemned by the Church, but they made such Complaints against the Proceedings of Councils, as they did? It is certain that *Leo Armenus* in the *East*, as well as *Charles*, and the *Western* Church, rejected that Council, *as contrary to Scripture*; which shews that neither in the *East* or *West*, did they think themselves so tied up by Definitions of Councils, proceeding in such a manner; but that they were at full Liberty to examine, and if they saw Cause, to reject such Definitions. While Councils did declare, That they intended to make use of no other Rule but Scripture, and to deliver only the Sense of the Catholick Church from the beginning, a great regard was to be shew'd to them: but when they set up another Rule, the Christian Church had just Reason not to submit to their Decrees. And to say, *This is the Plea of all Hereticks*, is just as if an innocent Person might not be allowed to plead *not Guilty*, because the greatest Malefactors do the same. There must be some certain Rules whereby to proceed in this Matter: and this is the first We fix upon, That they proceed as the Ancient Councils did according to Scriptures. Bell. de Concil. l. 2. c. 12. Niceph. cum Leone Armeno Disput. ed. Combefis, p. 162.

(2) The Ancient Hereticks were condemned by such Councils, as did represent the *Universal Church* after another manner, than the *Council of* Trent did. I do not say, There was ever such a *General Council*, as did fully represent the Universal Church, which could not be done without *Provincial Councils* summon'd before in all Parts of *Christendom*, and the Delegation from them of such Persons as were to deliver their Sense in the Matter of Faith, to be debated in the General Council; and I have Reason to question whether this were ever done. But however, there is a very great Difference in the Ancient Councils from the Modern, as to this point of *Representing*; for in them there was the Consent of all the *Patriarchs*, and a general Summons for the Bishops from all Parts to appear. But in the Modern Councils, *Four Patriarchs*, and the Bishops under them, have been excluded; and the Fifth hath summon'd the Bishops under him to meet together, and then hath called this a *General Council.* Which is just as if in the time of the *Heptarchy*, the King of *Mercia* should assemble the States under him, and call the *Convention* of them, *The Parliament of* England. Thus in the Council of *Trent*, the Pope Summons the Bishops that owned his Supremacy, and had taken Oaths to him, to meet together, and would have this pass for a *General Council.* When the Council met, and Cardinal

*Hosius* was appointed President in it; *Stanislaus Orechovius*, a warm and zealous *Romanist*, writes to *Hosius*, That it would very much conduce to their Reputation and Interest, if the Patriarchs of *Constantinople* and *Antioch* were summon'd to the Council, because the *Greeks* and *Armenians* depended upon them: *And he could not understand how the Catholick Church could be Represented without them, nor how the Council could be called Oecumenical.* To which *Hosius* replied, *That the Pope being Oecumenical Patriarch, a Council called by him, was an Oecumenical Council.* Now this we say, is extreamly different from the Notion of an *Oecumenical Council* in the Ancient times, and overthrows the Rights of other Churches, as they were settled by the Four General Councils; and therefore the Case is very different as to being condemned by General Councils, and by the late Conventions assembled by the Pope's Authority.

Hos. Oper. p. 373. Quandoquidem solus ille verè dicitur & est Oecumenicus patriarcha, quod Concilium ipsius est Auctoritate Congregatum, id verè dicitur Oecumenicum. De Concil. l. 1. c. 6.

(3.) Themselves allow that some Councils may be, and ought to be rejected, and therefore all our Business is to enquire whether we may not with as much Reason reject some Councils, as they do others. They reject the Council of *Ariminum*, which together with that of *Seleucia* (which sat at the same time) make up the most General Council we read of in Church-History. For *Bellarmine* owns that *there were 600 Bishops in the* Western *part of it.* So that there were many more Bishops assembled than were in the Council of *Nice*; there was no Exception against the Summons, or the Bishops present; and yet the Authority of this Council is rejected, because it was too much influenced by *Constantius*, and his Agents. The 2d. Council of *Ephesus* wanted no just Summons, no Presence of Patriarchs, or Number of Bishops, yet this is rejected, *because its Proceedings were too Violent.* The Councils of *Constantinople* against images are rejected; because, but *one Patriarch* was present in either of them. Now I desire to know, whether it be not as lawful to except against other Councils, as against these, supposing the Reasons to be the same; and greater Evidence to be given in these latter Times, of the Truth of the Allegations. Besides, we find they are divided in the Church of *Rome*, concerning their latter Councils: Some say, The Councils of *Pisa*, *Constance* and *Basil*, were true General Councils, and that the Council of *Lateran* under *Leo* X. was not so; others say, That the former have not the Authority of General Councils, but the latter hath. Some say, That there have been 18 *General Councils*; so the *Roman* Editors of the Councils, and others; but a great Number of these are rejected by others, who allow but 8 of the Number, *viz.* those wherein the *Eastern* and *Western* Bishops met. And so the Councils of *Lateran* and *Trent*, besides others, are cut off. What becomes then of the Articles of Faith, defined by those Councils? For they cannot be received on the Account of their Authority. However, we find this Objection lies equally against them, as against us. For, do not both these differing Parties side with the *Ancient Hereticks*, as much as we do? For they except against the *Supreme Judicature* in the Church, and decline the Judgment of these Councils, as much as those Hereticks did the Councils of their own Times.

These are therefore but ordinary *Topicks*, which may be reasonable or not, as they are applied.

(2.) It was answer'd, That the way proposed, doth not hinder Mens believing as they please, *i. e.* without sufficient Reason for their Faith; several Instances were given: As, believing the *Roman* Church to be the Catholick, without any Colour of Scripture, Reason or Antiquity; (as is now fully shew'd in the foregoing Discourse) believing against the most convincing Evidence of their own Senses. Believing the Lawfulness of the Worship of Images can be reconciled with God's forbidding it; the Communion in one Kind with Christ's Institution; and Praying in an unknown Tongue, with the 14th Chapter of the first Epistle to the *Corinthians*.

Repl. p. 8. To this the Replier saith only, *That these are voluntary Assumptions without Proof:* and his saying so, needs no Answer.

Def. p. 23. The Defender shelters himself under the *Catholick Church*, and resolves not to put to Sea with the Answerer about these things. But he knows very well, we utterly deny any of these to have been the Practice of the Universal Church according to *Vincentius Lerinensis* his Rules; by which we are content to be tried. And although he seems to which for such a Trial, yet I know a Reason why they ought to decline it, because I am certain they can never make it good in any one of them.

(2.) The second Inconvenience objected was, *That this would make the Wisdom of God fall beneath the Discretion of prudent Law-givers; who do not make Laws, and leave every Man to be his own Judge as to right or wrong:*

It was answered three Ways.

(1.) That there are Inconveniencies on both sides, and one ought to be provided

ded againſt, as well as the other; for as the People are not to be their own Judges, ſo it may happen that an Uſurper may pretend to the right of Interpreting the Laws, only to juſtifie his Uſurpation.

(2.) That the People are allowed in ſome Senſe to interpret the Laws, or elſe they could never underſtand the Duty they owe to their lawful King, and to juſtifie his Rights againſt all the Pretences of Uſurpers.

To this the Replier ſaith nothing, and the Defender ſaith that which is next to nothing to the firſt, and takes no notice of the ſecond Anſwer; and I think I therein tell him plainly enough, what I would be at. He ſaith, *I mean receiving and holding the true Faith by Uſurpation.* Nothing was farther from my Thoughts. But I had thought it were eaſie enough to know whom I meant, *viz.* ſuch a one as pretends to an Infallible Chair, which they cannot deny themſelves to be the higheſt Uſurpation, if he cannot prove his Title by Scripture, as we are ſure he cannot. Def. p. 24.

(3.) That in this Caſe a Rule is given to direct Perſons in the way to Heaven, and therefore muſt be capable of being underſtood by thoſe who are to make uſe of it for that end. Which being the greateſt Concernment to Mankind, they are therefore obliged to ſearch into it for their own Salvation; but we exclude not the help of Spiritual Guides, and embrace the ancient Creeds of the Church.

To this the Replier anſwers two Things:

(1.) *That an Infallible Guide is neceſſary to ſecure Perſons from wilful Errors, which he ſaith God hath provided. From wilful Error!* This is new Doctrine indeed, *That God hath provided a Remedy for wilful Error.* Had not our Saviour himſelf an Infallible Spirit, and yet we do not read that ever he ſecured Men from wilful Error; or ever deſigned to do it. But ſuppoſe an Infallible Judge could do this, he doth not tell us where he is to be found, who he is, and in what manner he doth thus ſecure Men, which are very neceſſary Enquiries; and without being ſatisfied in all theſe Points, we are ſtill left to be our own Judges, ſo far as concerns the Way to Salvation; ſince at the Day of Judgment we muſt anſwer for our ſelves, than which there can be no greater Obligation to Care and Sincerity in judging. Suppoſe a Man's Life depends upon the Benefit of his Clergy, and one comes to him and tells him, You are an ignorant Man, and liable to great Miſtakes in reading, therefore I adviſe you by no Means to truſt to your own Skill in Reading, for it is a horrible dark Letter, and many have been miſtaken that were more *Book-learned* than you; therefore take my Counſel, there is Mr. *Ordinary* who underſtands *Book-learning* a thouſand Times better than you or I, truſt him for the Reading, and no doubt you will eſcape. Ay, Sir, ſaith the Man, all that is very true that you ſay, but my Life lies at ſtake; and how if Mr. *Ordinary*'s Reading will not be allow'd by the Judge for mine, then I am a loſt Man paſt recovery; therefore I am reſolved to learn to read my ſelf; and to that end I will make the beſt uſe of his Skill to inſtruct me before-hand that I may be able to anſwer for my ſelf. This needs no Application.

But I do not ſee how an Infallible Guide ſhould be neceſſary to particular Perſons in order to their Salvation, upon the Principles owned and received by the greateſt Divines in the *Roman* Church. For *Aquinas* determines *that every one that hath ſaving Grace, hath likewiſe a Gift of Underſtanding whereby he is ſufficiently inſtructed in all Things neceſſary to Salvation, and that it is never withdrawn from them as to thoſe Things.* If this Doctrine hold good, I do not ſee any ſuch Neceſſity for Perſons to look after an Infallible Guide, as there is to look after ſaving Grace.

Circa ea quæ ſunt de neceſſitate ſalutis, ſufficienter inſtruuntur à Spiritu ſancto, 2, 2 Qu. 8. ar. 4. ad. 1.

*Gulielmus Pariſienſis* ſaith, *That Mens not looking after the way of Salvation themſelves, is that which will damn them. And in caſe of Difference among Guides, if a Man ſincerely makes Application to God, to know the Truth, he doth not queſtion but ſuch is the Mercy of God to keep ſuch a one from dangerous Error; or if he doth ſuffer him to fall into Error with a good Mind, it ſhall not be imputed to him.* It is a Doctrine generally receiv'd in the Schools, *That where-ever God doth beſtow his Grace, there goes along with it ſuch a Gift of Underſtanding, as keeps them from being deceived in the Matters they believe in order to Salvation. Henricus à Gandavo* thus expreſſes it. *That as Faith makes the Mind to reſt on the Authority of the Scripture, ſo this Gift of Underſtanding makes them perceive the Truth of what they are to believe.* And what need then ſuch an Infallible Guide?

Donum Intellectus nunquam ſe ſubtrahit ſanctis circa ea quæ ſunt neceſſaria ad ſalutem. ib. ad 3. Gul. Pariſien. de Legibus. c. 21, p. 57, 58. Pag. 59. D. Col. 1. Henr. à Gand. Sum. Art. 13. q. 4. n. 3.

(2.) He ſaith *That ancient Creeds will not ſerve, unleſs there be a Power in the Church to make new Deciſions in Matters of Faith.*

This ought to have been a little proved. For in Truth we are apt to think *the Faith once delivered to the Saints* as ſufficient to carry us to Heaven, as it was in the Apoſtles times. A Man is Heir to a good Eſtate, which by many Generations is

derived down from his Anceſtors, and he hath the Original Deeds in his Hands; one comes to him and tells him, it is a very fine Eſtate you are Heir to, and it is a thouſand Pities you ſhould want a good Title to it; I will put you into a way to get it, if you will give up your *muſty old Deeds*, and put your ſelf into the hands of ſuch Perſons as I ſhall name to you, they ſhall make you a new Settlement, and add ſeveral Parcels to your Eſtate which you had not before. I am content, ſaith the Heir, with my Anceſtors Eſtate, and I will never part with my old Deeds for all your *new Settlements*; for I am ſure my Anceſtors would never deceive me; But I know not what Deſigns you with your new Settlements may have upon me, and therefore I pray let me alone with my old Deeds.

Def. p. 26. The *Defender* here Dances upon Ropes, he makes ſwift and quick Motions, but he ſtands on a ſlender bottom, and he knows not whereon to fix, but would ſeem to ſay ſomething, but not enough to afford ſcope for an Anſwer. That which he aims at, is, *That unleſs a Man by judging Controverſies by the Infallible Rule, be able to come to an Infallible Determination, then Controverſies will not be infallibly determined, if every Man be left to be his own Judge.* And I am clearly of his Mind. But the point is, whether ſuch an infallible Determination of Controverſies be the neceſſary Way to Heaven? If a man can judge well enough to carry him thither, that is as much as I am concerned for at preſent.

P. 27. But he goes on. *Who can hope to be ſaved without pleaſing God? And every Body knows that without Faith it is impoſſible to pleaſe him.* There wants only one little thing to be added, *and without an Infallible Judge of Controverſies, there can be no Faith.* But this was forgotten.

But after all he ſaith, I confeſs *That Scripture is not the Rule of Controverſies.* I pray why? For I take it not only to be the *Rule*, but to be the *only Rule.* For ſaith he, *they are not ended till one ſide or other be certain.* What then? Is there no *Rule* that doth not put an end to Controverſies? Nay, their own Writers ſay *a Rule, as a Rule* cannot put an end to them, and therefore a *Judge* is neceſſary. But I muſt anſwer ſuch Things as they bring.

In Matters of Good and Evil, I ſaid every Man's Conſcience is his immediate Judge, and why not in Matters of Truth and Falſhood, unleſs we ſuppoſe Mens involuntary Miſtakes to be more dangerous than their wilful Sins.

Here the *Defender* triumphs. *How?* ſaith he, *Are we before we are aware come to Conſcience at laſt?* I heartily wiſh we were, that would tend more to the ending of Controverſies than an Infallible Judge.

But he wonders that in Diſputes of Religion *it ſhould before we are aware come to Conſcience at laſt.* Good man! *he was not aware* that there was any thing of Conſcience in the Matter. Doth he think it is only Matter of Intereſt we contend about? So thoſe who believe no Religion themſelves, think all Controverſies about Religion, to have nothing of *Conſcience* in them.

P. 28. But after a long Harangue, he ſaith, *That Conſcience can do no more than ſecure a Man from being judged for ſinning againſt his Conſcience: But if it lead him to do ill Things, or embrace a wrong Faith, what can he anſwer for the Sin of having that Conſcience?*

I grant where it is a Sin to have ſuch a Conſcience, the Conſcience doth not excuſe the Faults a Man commits by it. But the Queſtion we are upon is, whether it is not a Sin for a Man to have ſuch a Conſcience; and we are not upon the point of an *Erroneous Conſcience*, but of an *Infallible Judge* of *Conſcience* in Matters of good and evil. And it is ſtrange the Defender ſhould not ſee this. There is no queſtion,

but

but there are as disputable Points in Morality, as in matters of Faith; and we think Mens committing Sin, is at least as dangerous to their Souls, as embracing what they call *Heresy*. Now I desire to know, why it is not as necessary to have an infallible Guide in Manners, as in Faith? But, if they think that Men may be let alone to judge as well as they can in such Matters, as their Salvation certainly depends upon; what monstrous Inconvenience is it, if they use the same Liberty in matters of Speculation? I would he had given some better Answer, that I might have had an occasion to have inforced this matter. For in truth it seems to me, a very strange thing, when I read in the *New Testament*, such terrible Denunciations against the practice of Sin, and that Mens Happiness or Misery depends so much on their doing Good or Evil; and so very little said as to Mens Errors or Mistakes of Judgment (where there is a general Sincerity, as to a good Life, and a care to please God) that so much weight should be laid on an infallible Judg in matters of Controversy, and no care taken for an infallible Guide in matters of Practice.

But I am to consider, that it tends more to the interest of some People to swagger about an infallible Faith, than to secure the Practice of Virtue, and a good Life, which yet is certainly the great design and concernment of the Christian Religion, however it may seem to some, that an infallible Faith and Church are all in all.

To shew we do not allow every Man to believe as he pleases, I said, We not only allow the Assistance of spiritual Guides, and embrace the ancient Creeds; but think no Man ought to follow his own fancy, against Doctrines so universally received from the Apostles times.

But all this signifies nothing to him, unless our Guides be Infallible; and he saith, *They are plainly no Guides of Christs appointing, who teach any other Doctrine than he taught.* Very well! Let this then be the Rule, whereby we are to judg whether Guides are Infallible or not. But then have a care of telling us we must believe what Doctrine it was that Christ taught, upon the word of these Infallible Guides, for by that Doctrine we are to judg whether they are Infallible or not. The different methods of his Proceeding and mine in this matter, will be best understood by this Comparison. A Man that goes to enquire the way to a Place (he had a great desire to be at, but was afraid of mistaking the way) of two Men, and how he should avoid the dangerous passages in it; the one like a plain honest Man, tells him there are Difficulties in it, but he will give him a *Book* of the *Roads*, which acquaints him with all the dangerous turnings; he bids him look well to his Steps, and observe the way he goes, and when he is to seek, to search his Book, and ask such as understand the way better than he does: Alas! saith the other Man, this is a very sad Direction to him, for his Book may be misunderstood, and the Guides may mistake themselves with all their Care; but I will put him into an Infallible Way, whereby he may avoid all the Dangers. Ay Sir, saith the Traveller, you speak indeed to the purpose, I pray acquaint me with it. There is saith he to him, at such a Hill, a Person, who by the help of Wings, not only flies over all that dangerous Passage, but carries all those safe who take hold of him: You have therefore no better way than to pinion your self to him, and you will be safe. But saith the Traveller, how if he and I should tumble down together, what would become of us both? Never fear that, saith he: But how should I help fearing of it? Have any that he carried thither, come back and assured others of the safety of the Passage? No. But how then? Why saith he, You are bound to believe what he saith, for he af-

Def. p. 29.

firms that he can do it. But, saith the Traveller, this is very hard, I must venture Body and Soul upon his Skill and Strength, and I must take his Word that he hath both. This seems very unreasonable to me, and therefore I am resolved to take the other course, which tho' it do not make such big boasts of it self, is much more likely to be safe in the Conclusion, having better Reason on its side, and requiring a more constant care of my self, to which God hath promised more of his Grace and Assistance to secure me from all fatal mistakes of my way.

Where I mention *Doctrines so universally received in the Christian Church from the Apostles times, as those in the Creeds*; The Defender makes a notable Exception, *As if*, saith he, *any part of the universal Christian Doctrine were lost, and all had not been always as universally retained as the Creeds.* Then I hope all the Points in Controversy between us and them, can be proved by as clear and evident a Succession, as the Articles of the Creeds. If he can do this, he will be a *Champion* indeed. I desire him to take his choice, either *Supremacy*, *Transubstantiation*, *Infallibility of the* Roman *Catholick Church*, or which he pleases. I grant all true Christian Doctrine was universally retained, as far as the Rule of it was so received; but if he means any of those distinguishing points between us and them, when he comes to make it out, he will be of another mind.

(3.) A third Inconvenience objected in the Papers, against the want of an infallible Judg, was, *That Scripture would be interpreted by Fancy; which is the same thing as to follow Fancy.*

To this it was answer'd.

(1.) That our Church owns the Creeds, Councils, Fathers and Primitive Church, more frankly than any other Church, and therefore cannot be suspected to leave Scripture to be so interpreted.

Reply, p. 21. The Replier saith, *We only pretend it, and do it not.* That is to be proved, for bare saying it, will never convince us. But his proof is, *because, if we had done it*, we had never deserted the Church of *Rome*; and our Answer is, we therefore deserted the Communion of that Church, because She required owning things from us, for which She had no Authority, either from Scripture, Creeds, Councils or Fathers.

Def. p. 30. The Defender would have me answer directly, *Whether it be not the same to follow Fancy, as to interpret Scripture by it?* As tho' I were examined at the Catechism, which requires all Answers to be made by *Yea* or *Nay*. I said enough to shew the Question doth not concern us; for we do not allow Persons to interpret Scripture by Fancy. And withal. (2.) I asked some other Questions to shew, That those who pretend to Infallibility, may do things as unreasonable as leaving Scripture to be interpreted by Fancy. And I have our Saviours Example for answering one question with another.

The Instances I gave, were these; The Church of *Rome* assuming to it self the Power of interpreting the Rule, which concerns its own Power of interpreting; which was to make it Judg in its own Cause, and to give it as great Power, as if it *made* the Rule; and I further added, that *Interest* is as mischievous an Interpreter of Scripture, as *Fancy*; and therefore, those who are so much concerned, are not to be relied on, either in Councils, or out.

The Power of declaring Tradition is as Arbitrary a thing in the Church of *Rome*, as interpreting Scripture by Fancy. There being no other Rule allowed by it, but the Sense of the present Church.

The Replier, like a fair Adversary, gives his answer plainly; which con-

Reply, p. 21. sists in two things. (1.) *That their Church gives no Sense of Scripture, but what*

*what She received from Tradition of the foregoing Church, and ſo he calls it Apoſtolical Tradition.* But ſuppoſe there happen a Queſtion, whether it be ſo or not, muſt not all be reſolved into the Authority of the preſent Church, declaring what is Apoſtolical Tradition? And ſo it comes all to one.

(2.) He ſaith, *Tradition is publick, and Fancy is private.* But I ſay, according to their Rules, *Tradition* is but *publick Fancy*, and ſo *Fancy* in particular Perſons is a *private Tradition*; but whether publick or private, if it be equally Arbitrary, the Caſe is alike.

The Defender ſaith, *All this is beſides the Buſineſs*, and therefore ſlides off as well as he can, with ſome ſlight touches, which deſerve no Anſwer. Def. p. 31.

(4.) *If there be no infallible Judg, the Power of deciding matters of Faith will be given to every particular Man, for which no place can be ſhewed.*

The anſwer was, That if by deciding matters of Faith, no more be meant, but every Mans being ſatisfied of the Reaſons, why he believes one thing to be true, and not another; that belongs to every Man as he is bound to take care of his Soul, and muſt give an account both to God and Man, of the Reaſon of his Faith.

*This*, the Replier ſaith *is bringing every Article of Faith to the Teſt of ones own Reaſon; whereas Authority is the Correlative of Believing, and Reaſon of Knowledg.* Reply, p. 22.

We do not pretend that every one that believes, ſhould be able to judg from meer Principles of Reaſon of the Credibility of the Doctrine propos'd; it is ſufficient, if he finds it to be of Divine Revelation, by being contained in Gods word. And it is not the Authority of the Church, but of Divine Revelation, which Faith bottoms upon; the former is no more than an inducement to believe thoſe Books we call Scripture, to contain the word of God in them. But when we find any Doctrine therein, we account that ſufficient Reaſon for believing it.

The Defender finds no fault with our ſaying, *We ought to be ſatisfied of the Reaſon why we believe*; but the Queſtion he puts, is, *Whether there be indeed any Reaſons why they ſhould believe beſides the Authority of the Church?* He doth not deny that particular Men ought to judg; *but the meaning of the Papers*, he ſaith, is, *that they ought not to judg unreaſonably.* Def. p. 32.

Then we have no difference, for I aſſure him I never pleaded for mens judging unreaſonably. The Queſtion then between us, is, Whether thoſe who do not believe upon the Infallible Authority of the *Roman* Catholick Church, Do judg unreaſonably? *i. e.* Whether there be equal Grounds to believe the *Roman Catholick Church Infallible*, as there are to believe the Scriptures to be the Word of God? We utterly deny the *Roman* Churches Infallibility to be neceſſary to our believing the Scripture; for we receive that by an *Univerſal Tradition* from all the Apoſtolical Churches; which is as clear for this, as it is wanting for the other. And therefore we muſt judg more reaſonably. What follows about the Infallibility promiſed to the Church, hath been anſwered already.

As to the *Canonical Books*, I ſhewed it was no *Authoritative Deciſion* by a Power in the Church to make Books *Canonical* which were not ſo, but a meer giving *Teſtimony* in a *Matter of Fact*, in which all parts of the Church are concerned; and it depends as other Matters of Fact do, on the Skill and Fidelity of the Reporters: And ſo far I own the truly *Catholick Church* to have Authority in any Teſtimony, delivering down the Books of Scripture; but this proves no more *Infallibility* in the Chriſtian Church as to the Books of the *New Teſtament*, than it doth in the *Jewiſh Church* as to the Books of the *Old Teſtament*.

And thus much of the *Authority* of the *Catholick Church* in Matters of Faith.

## III. *Of the Reformation of the Church of* England.

THere are so many Passages in the Papers relating to the Church of *England*, on the Account of her Reformation, that I thought it the best Method of proceeding to handle this Subject by it self. And there are these things charged upon it, either in Terms or by Consequence, in the Papers, which as I am a Member of this Church, I think my self bound to clear; for I could not justifie continuing in her Communion, if she were justly liable to these Imputations.

1. That she hath made a causeless Breach in the Communion of the Catholick Church.

2. That she hath been the occasion of a World of Heresies crept into this Nation.

3. That she hath not sufficient Authority within her self, and yet denies an Appeal to a higher Judicature.

4. That she contradicts her own Rule, *viz.* the Holy Scriptures.

5. That she subsists only on the Pleasure of the Civil Magistrate.

All these I shall examine with Care, and consider what hath been said in Defence of the Papers upon these Heads.

As to the charge of causeless Breach in the Communion of the Catholick Church, it lies in these Words, *And by what Authority Men separate themselves from that Church?*

Which being spoken with respect to the Members of the Church of *England*, do imply that they have made a Separation from the Communion of the Catholick Church, and that they had no sufficient Authority for so doing, and therefore are guilty of Schism in it.

To the Question two Answers were given, 1. By distinguishing the truly Catholick Church from the *Roman*-Catholick: And a Distinction between these being made out, (which is done in the first part of this Defence) It doth not follow that we have made a Breach in the Communion of the Catholick Church, because we do not join in Communion with the *Roman* Catholick: This was illustrated by the Example of a prosperous Usurper in a Kingdom, who challenges a Title to the whole, by gaining a considerable part of it, and requires from all the Kings Subjects within his Power, to own him to be rightful King; whereupon the Question was put, Whether refusing to do it, were an Act of Rebellion or of Loyalty? So in the Church, the Popes Authority over it, so as to restrain Catholick Communion only to those who own it, is not only looked on as an Usurpation by Us, but by all the *Eastern* Churches; and is in Truth altering the *Terms* of Christian Communion from what they were in the truly Catholick and Apostolick Church: Therefore since the Conditions required are unreasonable, because different from them, what Breach hath followed, is not to be imputed to those who refuse these Terms, but to those who impose them, and so the Guilt of it lies upon the Church of *Rome*, and not upon the Church of *England*. This is the Substance of the Answer.

Reply. p. 25. To which the Replier saith, *That the* Eastern *Churches cannot be parts of the Catholick Church, because they hold not the Apostolick Doctrine contained in the Creeds and Councils owned by the Church of* England. This hath been fully answered already. But he goes on, *There were no other Churches then*

*in*

*in being, but thoſe which were in Communion with the Church of* Rome; *conſequently the Church of* England *going out from them, ſeparated her ſelf from the Catholick Apoſtolick Church.*

And the Defender ſaith, *He expects I ſhould ſhew That truely Catholick and Apoſtolick Church we held Communion with, when we ſeparated from the* Roman. *He deſires to know where the men live, that people may go to them, and learn of them, what their Faith is,* &c. Def. p. 39.

In anſwer to this, I ſay, That there is no neceſſity for us to ſhew any Church diſtinct from others, which in all things we agreed with; becauſe we hold all particular Churches liable to Errors and Corruptions; and that the notion of the Catholick Church may take in ſuch Particulars from which we may ſee reaſon to diſſent: But we do not thereby exclude them from being parts of the Catholick Church; but we ſay they are no Infallible Rule to us, and therefore we ought to proceed by what the Church hath receiv'd as an Infallible Rule, and not by the Communion of other Churches. And ſuppoſing there were no particular Church we did in all things joyn with, the Church of *England* might Reform it ſelf without ſeparating from the Catholick Apoſtolick Church. For it was then in the Caſe, particular Churches were in after the Councils of *Ariminum* and *Seleucia*; for then the Standard of Catholick Communion, ſet up by the Council of *Nice*, was taken down; and the ſetting of it up again, was to oppoſe the Conſent of the Chriſtian Church in the moſt General Council that ever aſſembled. I do not ſay, this Council obliged Men to profeſs *Arrianiſm*, but that it took away the Authority of the *Nicene Creed* in as valid a manner as the Council by its Acts could do it; I ask then, by what Authority any particular Church could ſet up the *Nicene* Faith; and if not, how it was poſſible to be reſtored? And *I deſire to know in what Country the people lived, who then owned the* Nicene *Faith againſt ſuch a General Council? And where were the Churches in being, which at that time adhered to it?* But if in this Caſe the *Britiſh Church*, tho' alone, was bound notwithſtanding ſuch a general conſent, to Reform it ſelf, and to reſtore the Authority of the *Nicene* Creed; the ſame Caſe it is, when the Weſtern Church was oppreſſed and hindered from Reforming Errors and Abuſes by the Uſurpation and Tyranny of the Papal Faction; the Church of *England* was then obliged to exerciſe its own Inherent Right, in bringing things to the ſtate they were in, in the time of the firſt General Councils. In matters of Reformation, the main enquiries are, whether there be juſt Occaſion, and due Authority for it, and a certain Rule to proceed by; the laſt and leaſt important Queſtion is, what Company we have to joyn with us in it? For there is a Natural Right in every Church to preſerve its own juſt Liberties, and conſequently to throw off ſuch an Uſurpation as that of the Popes was. And the main Point in order to a Reformation, was caſting off the Popes Power, as an encroachment upon the Ancient and Canonical Privileges of the Weſtern Churches, which was done here by a General conſent even of thoſe Biſhops, who held in Communion with the *Roman* Church, as far as thoſe could do who rejected the Head of it. And this is the Fundamental Point as to the matter of Schiſm: If the Pope, as Head of the Church, doth influence Catholick Communion ſo far, that it is neceſſary to Salvation to live in ſubjection to him, it will be very hard to juſtify ſeparation from that Body whereof he is the viſible Head. But if there be no Scripture, no Councils, no Univerſal Tradition for this, as the *Roman* Catholick Biſhops here declared in the time of *H.* 8. then there can be no Schiſm in acting without Authority from him, or againſt his Authority. And whether any

other

other Church joyned with ours or not, is no more material to the justification of the Reformation, than the lawfulness of any one Counties acting for the Royal Family in the late times of Usurpation, did depend upon the concurrence of others with it. What more commonly talked of, and magnified in the Church of *Rome*, than the *Reformation* of the *Monastick Orders*? And some of the Persons have been Canonized who have done it; But in this Case, the Governour of a Monastick Order, proceeding according to the Rules of his Order, doth a very justifiable thing, tho' never another Monastry joyn with him in it; because he only doth his Duty, and proceeds by the Rules which are receiv'd by the whole Order. This, I say, was the Case of the Church of *England* in Reforming according to Scripture, and the sense of the Primitive Church; and if others joyned, so much the better; if not, the Act justifies it self, and needs not the concurrence of others to make it good.

(2.) The 2*d* Answer was, That there is a difference between voluntary Separation, and that which is unavoidable, in case unreasonble conditions of Communion be required.

Def. p. 39. The Defender pretends *He can by no means understand this unavoidable Separation; because tho' Men be separated from the Communion of the Church, yet they may continue of the same Faith if they please: but if they have another Faith, they separate themselves, even supposing Usurpation, or whatever I would have.*

Now this seems very strange to me from a Person who knows the Terms of Communion with the *Roman Church*. Can any Man be a true Member thereof, who doth not own and profess to believe the Popes Supremacy, Transubstantiation, &c. Is he not by the constitution of that Church required to believe all that the *Roman Church* believes? But suppose Men do not, and cannot for their Hearts believe as that Church believes; can they notwithstanding be Members of it? No, he confesses *a different Faith unavoidably casts them out*. But then to believe otherwise than the *Roman Church* believes, casts them out unavoidably. The Question now is, who is the cause of this casting out, those who cannot believe those Doctrines, or those who require the belief of them in order to Communion? If these Doctrines be evident in Scripture, or were defined by the four General Councils, or are contained in the ancient Creeds, or can be clearly proved by Universal Tradition, then we confess the blame falls on those who refuse; but if none of those can be made appear to the satisfaction of a mans mind who desires to search out Truth, then their separation is unavoidable, and there is no reason to make it their voluntary act. But, saith

Def. p. 40. the Defender, *a mans faith is his own voluntary act.* I grant that; but not a voluntary cause of Separation: which two ought to be distinguished in this case. As in the case of Usurpation, the owning the lawful King is a voluntary act; but if an Usurper threatens to banish him if he doth not abjure him; upon whom must the blame be laid, upon the Mans voluntary Act, or the Usurpers voluntary imposing such a penalty on those who do nothing but what is just? The Defender did not consider that the making such terms of Communion was a voluntary act too, and being a thing unreasonable and unjust, it leaves the blame upon the Imposers.

*But he denies any such thing as Usurpation in the Pope, because he hath shewed by his reiterated Approbation of the Bishop of* Meaux's *Book, that he is content with that submission and obedience, which the Holy Councils and Fathers have always taught the Faithful.*

These are very fine words to deceive the unwary. But I pray tell us,

who

who is to declare *what the Councils and Fathers have always taught the Faithful? Who is to be Judg?* Is not the Pope himſelf? For no Council will be allowed without his Approbation and Confirmation. And is not this then a very pretty Artifice to draw weak Perſons into a Snare? For my part, I do not wonder at the *Popes Approbation of the Biſhop of* Meaux's *Book*, no more than I would at a Gentlemans Approbation of a fine ſpun Net when he goes a fiſhing, which is not ſo eaſily diſcerned, and yet doth as effectually catch the Game: Some there are ſtill who love to be deceived, and ſome have more arts of deceiving than others; and thoſe who gain moſt by it, will be ſure to give them the greateſt Approbation.

The Defender proceeds: *Suppoſe there were Uſurpation, muſt People there-* Pag. 41.
*fore believe otherwiſe than they did before; as that there is no change of Subſtance, no Purgatory, no more than two Sacraments, and the reſt?*

The Queſtion about Faith is one thing, and about Separation is another. We are now upon the latter of theſe; and in this caſe we are moſt concerned about the Popes Authority, ſince he is look'd on by you as the Head of the Catholick Church, and the Center of Communion. If there were no ſuch Uſurpation, yet we ſhould never decline giving an account of the Reaſons of our Faith, as to Sacraments, Purgatory, or what you pleaſe of the Points in difference between us. Which I neither deſire to make greater or leſſer, than really they are. For there may be deceit both ways.

As to his renewing the Queſtion, *by what Authority we ſeparate?* I anſwer, Def. p. 42.
by the ſame Authority which makes it unlawful for us to profeſs what we do not believe; and to practiſe what we believe God hath forbidden: This is juſt as if one ſhould ask by what Authority Men are bound to be honeſt and ſincere; and to prefer Gods Laws before Mens? For the Church of *Rome* requires from the Members of her Communion, beſides matters of Faith, ſuch acts of Worſhip, which, whatever they be, to thoſe who believe as they do, muſt be *Idolatrous* to thoſe that believe as we do. For Example, ſuppoſe in *China*, where they believe *God* to be the ſame with the *World*, ſome of the *Chineſes* (who on that account think they may lawfully give Divine Worſhip to any part of the World) to be converted by the *Miſſionaries*, who tell them the parts of the World cannot be God, for he is Infinite and Immutable, and Wiſe, and Powerful, which the Parts of the World are not, and cannot be, and therefore they cannot without Idolatry give Divine Worſhip to them; the *Mandarins* require their giving the ſame *Adorations* that others do; they refuſe and ſay, Whatever you may do, who believe God and the World to be the ſame, certainly it would be groſs Idolatry in us, who believe the thing you worſhip, to be nothing but dull inſenſible parts of the World. And if now it ſhould be asked, By what Authority they ſeparate? Is there not a plain Anſwer, By the Authority of God himſelf, who requires Adoration to be given to himſelf alone?

*But who ſhall be Judg*, ſaith the Defender? God himſelf will be Judg at Pag. 43.
the great Day, whether we will or not. And I think that is more to be regarded, than putting an end to Controverſies. if we be not ſincere and faithful to him and his ſervice, if we do not act and judg with a regard to the Judgment of that day, all the pretences in the World of a Judg in Controverſies, then will ſtand in no ſtead. If we do uſe our careful endeavours to know the will of God, and to do it, we have great reaſon to hope God will ſhew Mercy to us; and then the Queſtion will not appear of ſuch wonderful Importance, *Who ſhall be Judge here?*

But we do not decline a reaſonable Judgment in this World; we only deſire our Judges may be fair and equal, and ſuch as God hath appointed. And

if

if those who would judg for us, pretend that they have a Divine Commission, we desire to know who shall be Judg of this pretence? We have no reason to trust them; and they will not trust us. So that here we art stopt at first, unless the Commission be produced, which impowers those Persons to judg, who challenge such Authority over our Judgments. A general indefinite obscure Commission, which may extend to all other Guides in the Church as well as to them, will by no means be sufficient. Let us see whom Christ hath appointed in his own words, and we will submit; for we look on him as Supreme Judg and Legislator to his Church; and if he hath thought fit to appoint an Infallible Judg, we have done. But we desire to know where he hath done it? Hath he granted any new Commission from Heaven? No. Is it to be found in Scripture? Yes. But then I pray observe, you tell us Scripture cannot be Judg in any Controversy, being ambiguous, uncertain, general, mute, flexible, and what not? and because it cannot hear Parties, nor give a decisive Voice, it can by no means be a Judg of Controversies. How then can the Scripture put an end to this Controversie, when it can put an end to none? Are the Expressions in this matter so particular, so clear, so peremptory, that we cannot mistake about the sense of them? If so, then I perceive, notwithstanding all the hard words given it, Scripture may be Judge as well as a Rule, because it is fitted to put an end to such a Controversie, which is as doubtful as any; and why not as well to all the rest? We are not then afraid of this Question, *Who shall be Judg?* But we desire to be satisfied about it; and to know not only who hath appointed him, but who he is, whether the Pope *in Cathedrâ*, or a General Council? For this is very material for us to know, since even at this day you are far from being agreed about it. The Assembly of the Clergy of *France*, have solemnly declared within few years, *That they do not believe the Popes Judgment to be Infallible.* The Clergy of *Hungary* have rejected and censured this Declaration as *absurd and detestable, and have forbidden any to read, hold, or teach the Doctrine, and own the Pope to be the only Infallible Judg of Controversies.* A *Sorbon Doctor* in his Notes on the *Hungarian Censure*, calls this, *The new Heresie of the Jesuits*; on the other side, large Volumes have been Printed to prove, *that the right of judging infallibly, belongs only to the Pope.*

Cler. Gallica. Declaratio Prop. 4. 1682.

Censura Hungarica. 24 Oct. 1682.

And now very lately comes out a Learned Book by another Doctor of the of the *Sorbon*, to prove *not only that the Popes Judgment is not Infallible, but that it is a dangerous thing to believe it; and that no Man ought to do it, unless infallible proof be brought of it.* But he proves at large, that not so much as probable evidence can be brought for it, either from *Scripture* or *Tradition.*

Tractat. de Libertat. Eccles. Gallican. Leodii, 1684. Regale Sacerdotium Romano Pontifici assertum. Auctore Eugenio Lombardo, 1684.

I pray now the Defender to tell me, *Who is the Judg?* Is the Pope Infallible or not? *It is easily answer'd I, or no.* And it is necessary to be answer'd, if we must know, *Who is the Judg?*

The common Evasion is, *That you are agreed, that Popes and Councils together are?* but this is but an Evasion. For the Infallibility is by virtue of Divine Promises, and those must either relate to the Church as the subject of them; or to the Successors of St. *Peter* in their capacity as such. If to the former, the Popes have nothing to do in it, but as included in the Church; if the latter, the Councils have no Infallibility, but the Pope. To say *the Council is Infallible, when confirmed by the Pope*, is Nonsense. For, either it was Infallible in its Decree, or not. If not, it can borrow no Infallibility from the Popes subsequent Confirmation; but the Popes Judgment may be said to be Infallible, but by no means the Councils. And *Du Pin* hath proved, that there cannot be two Seats of Infallibility; for whereever there is

De Antiqua Ecclesiæ Disciplina Dissert 5. Auct. Lud. Ellies DuPin, 1686.

Dissert. 5. c. 1. sect. 2.

Infalli-

Infallibility, it can receive no addition or force from another Infallibility; and whatever is Infallible, must be believed for it self, and not depend on anothers Judgment. And therefore I again desire the Defender to make no harangues about this matter, but to answer directly, *Who is the Judg?* For *we would fain be acquainted with this some body*, as he speaks; but I am afraid his *some body* of Infallibility, will prove a more *pleasing Dream* than what he charges me with in what follows. Pag. 44.

I had given a fair account of the proceedings in *England* upon the Reformation, how the search began, the Popes Authority to be discarded, and the Articles of Religion to be drawn up, which ought not to be looked on as particular Fancies, but the sense of our Church.

All this he calls *a pleasing Dream*; I am sure the pretence of Infallibility is so; but I related matter of fact, which he hath no mind to meddle with, but he runs again to his, *Who shall be Judg?* And concludes, *that I think between Churches there's none at all.* I do think the Church of *England* in this divided state of the Catholick Church, is under no Superior Judicature, but that it hath sufficient Power and Authority to reform Abuses, and to declare Articles of Religion so as to oblige its Members to Conformity; especially since it proceeds by such excellent Rules, as the *Holy Scriptures*, the ancient Councils, and Universal Tradition. And I hope this may pass for a direct Answer. Pag. 45.

The Replier takes another course besides this, for he makes use of these two Topicks against the Church of *England*: 1. *That the Church of* Rome *was in possession of all those Truths we rejected.* 2. *That we ought to bring positive Texts for our Negative Articles.* Reply, p. 25. Pag. 27.

1. As to the Plea of *Possession of all those Truths now question'd by us.* This were a pleasant thing for us to question them, if we owned they were *Truths*; but he means only that he thinks them so. Well then, how is it their Church was *in possession* of those Truths? Do they become *Truths* by their possession, or only that they were *Truths* they were then possessed of? If so, he must first prove them to be *Truths*, or the *Possession* signifies nothing. And that is the point I went upon, that no *Possession* gives a right to *Truth*; but the Church of *England* had just reason to examine whether these were *Truths* or not; and upon examination finding them to be otherwise, it had reason to reject them.

But to inforce this, he saith afterwards, *That their Church had a thousand years prescription here, and that their Religion came into this Nation with Christianity.* Reply, p. 40.

Although according to St. *Cyprian*'s Rule, *all this proves no more than the Antiquity of Error, unless the proof be made from Scripture*, yet because this goes a great way with some People, I do not only deny the truth of it, but shall give evident proof to the contrary.

For I suppose it will not be questioned, that the Religion brought in here *by Augustin* and his Companions, was the Religion of *Gregory the Great*; I shall therefore compare the Doctrine of the Council of *Trent* with that of *Gregory*, in some remarkable Particulars, and shew the great Difference between them as to these things.

1. *Scripture and Tradition.*

Council of *Trent*,

DEclares, *That it receives Traditions with an equal Veneration with Holy Scriptures*, Sess. 4.

*Gregory the Great*,

AFfirms, *That all things which edifie and instruct, are contained in the Volume of Scriptures*, in Exek. Hom. l. 1. cap. 8.

*That Gods Mind is to be found in his Words*, Regist. Epist. l. 4. Ep. 40.

*That the Scripture is the Glass of the Elect*, in Reg. l. 4. c. 10. in Job l. 2. c. 1.

*That to be born of God, is to love his Will revealed in Scripture*, in 1 Reg. c. 14.

*That Preachers are to instruct their People in what they learn, out of the Holy Scriptures*, Greg. Sacram. in Consecr. Episcopi.

*That the Staves being in the Rings on the sides of the Ark, do shew that Teachers should have the Holy Scriptures in their Hearts, that from thence they may presently teach whatever is needful*, de Cura Pastor, l. 2. c. 11.

2. *Apochryphal Books.*

*The Council of* Trent,

REckons the *Maccabees* among *the Canonical Books*, Sess. 4.

*Gregory the Great*,

PLainly rejects *them* from being *Canonical*; for he excuses taking an *Example out of them, not being Canonical*, Moral. in Job l. 19. c. 13.

3. *Merit of Good Works.*

*The Council of Trent*,

ANathematizes *those who deny good Works to be truly meritorious of Grace and Eternal Life*, Sess. 6. Can. 32.

*Gregory the Great*,

DEnies *the most sanctified Persons to procure Divine Wisdom by their Graces*, in Job l. 18. c. 26.

*Affirms, that the best Men will find no Merit in their best Actions*, Moral. l. 9. c. 2.

*That all human Righteousness will be found unrighteousness, if strictly judged*, Ib. l. 9. c. 11.

*That if he should attain to the highest Virtue, he should obtain eternal Life, not by Merits, but by Pardon*, Ib.

4. *Auricular*

4. *Auricular Confeſſion.*

*The Council of* Trent,

DEclares ſecret *Confeſſion of all ſins to be neceſſary in order to Remiſſion and Abſolution by the Prieſt*, Seſſ. 14. c. 6, 7, 8.

*Gregory the Great*,

SPeaks of no other Confeſſion than what was required in order to the *Reconciliation* of thoſe who had undergone *publick Penance*, the Cuſtom whereof at *Rome*, is ſet down in *Gelaſius* his *Sacramentary*, p. 63. And *Gregory* refers to the Cuſtom then uſed, in his *Sacramentary*, p. 225. And there is no Form of *Abſolution* in either of them, but by way of *Prayer to God*, which is different from a *Sacramental, Judicial Abſolution*, required by the Council of *Trent*.

*He makes no Abſolution true, but that which follows the judgment of God, which he parallels with the looſing of* Lazarus *after Chriſt had raiſed him from the Grave*, Hom. 26. in Evangel.

5. *Solitary Maſſes.*

*The Council of* Trent,

ANathematizes *thoſe who ſay ſuch Maſſes wherein the Prieſt only communicates, are unlawful, and to be abrogated.* Seſſ. 22. Can. 8.

*Gregory the Great*,

FOrbids *the Prieſt to celebrate alone, and ſaith expreſly it ought not to be celebrated by one, becauſe the People are to bear their ſhare*, Greg. lib. Capital. c. 7. apud Caſſandr. Liturg. c. 33.

6. *Tranſubſtantiation.*

*The Council of* Trent,

DEclares *the Body of Chriſt to be in the Euchariſt under the Species of Bread*, Seſſ. 13. Cap. 1.

*That aſſerts only the Species to remain after Conſecration*, ib. c. 4.

*Gregory the Great*,

ASſerts *the Body of Chriſt after his Reſurrection to be palpable, i. e.* That it may be ſeen and felt where it is, and that he proved this againſt *Eutychius of Conſtantinople*, Moral. l. 14. c. 31.

He frequently declares, *That our Bodies as well as our Souls, are nouriſhed by the Euchariſt, which cannot be done by mere ſpecies*; for no Accidents can produce a Subſtance, *Greg. Sacram. 16. Kal. Mart. in Sexageſ. Hebd. 3, in Quadrag. Fr. 4.*

### 7. *Communion in one Kind.*

*Council of* Trent,

DEclares *against the necessity of Communion in both kinds*, Sess. 13. Cap. 13.

*Gregory the Great*,

AFfirms it to be *the constant practice for the People to receive in both.*

*Sacram. in Quadrag. Fr.* 3.
*6 Kal. Julii ad Complend.*
*Hebd.* 3. *in Quadr. Sabbato.*
*Miss. Temp. Belli.*
*Sexages. ad Complend.*
*Domin. in Ramis Palm.*
VI. *Non. Julii ad Complend.*
VIII. *Kal. Aug. ad Compl.*
*Kalend. Aug. ad Compl.*

The like may be observed in *Gelasius* his *Sacramentary*, who declared it *Sacrilege to do otherwise*; as appears by the known Canon, *Comperimus. De Consecr. Dist.* 2. who was one of *Gregory*'s Predecessors, and not long before him.

### 8. *Purgatory.*

*Council of* Trent,

DEclares *that there is a Purgatory after this Life, out of which Souls may be helped by the Prayers of the faithful*, Sess. 25.

*Gregory the Great*,

AFfirms, *That at the time of Death, either the good or evil Spirit seizeth upon the Soul, and keeps it with it for ever without any change.* Moral. in Job, l. 8. c. 8. ed. Basil. c. 9. ed. Novæ. *That, in the day of death, the just goes to Joy, and the wicked with the Apostate Angel is reprobated.* Moral. in Job, l. 12. c. 4.

The Passages in his *Dialogues*, which seem to contradict these, do not come up to the Council of *Trents Purgatory*; for they only speak of a *Purgation* for *light* and *venial Sins*, and not for the temporal pain of mortal Sins, * whose Guilt is remitted: But in the former places he plainly denies any change of State after this Life; so that the Purgation he speaks of, must be consistent with a *State of Joy*; and in that very place, he saith, *Persons shall be at the day of Judgment, as they were when they went out of the World.*

* Dial. 4. c. 39.

9. *Masses*

9. *Masses for the Dead.*

*The Council of* Trent,

DEclares, *That they are intended for those who are dead in Christ, not yet fully purged from their sins,* Sess. 22. c. 2.

*Gregory the Great,*

SUpposes those to be in *a state of Bliss*, for whom the *Oblation* was made at the Altar, as appears by the Sacramentary IV. Kalend. *Julii*, where the *Oblation* is first mention'd; and after follows, *Deus qui animæ famuli tui Leonis eternæ beatitudinis præmia contuliſti.*

10. *Worship of Images.*

*The Council of* Trent,

DEclares, *not only that Images are to be placed in Temples, but to be worshipped there,* Sess. 25.

*Gregory the Great,*

ALlows *their being in Temples, but denies any worship to be given to them.* For he not only often denies *any Adoration* to be given them; but he saith, *They are only for Instruction*; which excludes *Relative Worship.* Regiſtr. Epiſt. l. 9. Ep. 9. l. 7. Ep. 110.

The Epiſtle to *Secundinus Guſſanvillæus* in his late Edition of S. *Gregory*, saith, was not to be found in the most Ancient MSS.

11. *Extreme Unction.*

*The Council of* Trent,

ANathematizes *those who do affirm it not to be a true and proper Sacrament, appointed by Christ for Remission of Sins, and conferring Grace.* Sess. 14. Can. 1, 2.

*Gregory the Great,*

MEntions the *Unction* then used in order to *the Recovery of sick Persons*; and in the Prayer applies S. *James* his Words that way; and then adds, *Sana quoque quæsumus, omnium medicator ejus Febrium, & cunctorum languorum cruciatus ægritudinemq;, &c.* Sacram. p. 253. And immediately before, in the Unction, these words are said, *Per hanc sacrati olei Unctionem*—priſinam & emmelioratem recipice merſaris ſanitatem. Ib.

And that it was not looked on as the laſt Sacrament, appears by things in that Sacramentary:

1. *The Euchariſt was to be given after it.*

2. *It*

| *Council of* Trent, | *Gregory the Great*, |
|---|---|
| | 2. *It was to be continued for seven days* if there were occasion; *& suscitabit eum Deus*; which shews that it was designed for bodily health. |

12. *Pope's Supremacy.*

| *Council of* Trent, | *Gregory the Great*, |
|---|---|
| OWned it from beginning to end; and referr'd the Confirmation of its Decrees to the *Pope*, as *Supreme Head of the Church.* | DEclares the *Headship* of the *Church* to be *peculiar to Christ.* Regiſtr. Ep. l. 4. Ep. 36, 38. where he ſpeaks not of an *Eſſential Head*, but of the *Fountain* of *Juriſdiction.*<br>He urges it as an inconvenience, If there were a *Head* of the *Church*, *the Church muſt err with him.* Epiſt. 32. 36.<br>Which *Bellarmin* owns to be a true Conſequence. *De R. Pont. l.* 4. *c.* 5.<br>He makes it the *Pride of Lucifer*, *and the forerunning of Antichriſt*, *for one Biſhop to ſet himſelf above the reſt.* Ep. 36.<br>Not to be the *Sole Biſhop*; *but to have all the reſt in ſubjection to him.* |

Theſe things may be ſufficient at preſent, to ſhew how little ground there is to ſay, That the Religion now owned in the Church of *Rome*, was brought in hither with Chriſtianity in the time of *Gregory the Great.*

(2.) The Replier ſaith, *We ought to bring poſitive Texts for our negative Articles*; *as no Praying to Saints*, *no Purgatory*, *no Worſhip of Images*, *no Tranſubſtantiation*, *and the like*; *with which*, he ſaith, *the* 39 *Articles are ſtuft* But why muſt we be obliged to bring Texts for the *Negative*? *Becauſe* he ſaith, *we make theſe Articles of Faith.*

Reply, p. 27.

To anſwer this, Let us ſuppoſe the Common Council of the City ſhould agree to make Men ſwear that the Monument near *London Bridge*, is a living Creature, and ſhould exclude all thoſe from the City Privileges who do not; and that others having examin'd the Monument, and found nothing but Stones and Iron, were reſolved to follow their Senſes, and declare their Minds, That upon due Conſideration, they did judge the Monument to be no living Creature; Would any ſay, theſe Men made it an Article of their Faith, when they only rejected a falſe Propoſition impoſed upon the Faith of others? Why may not a Church declare what it doth not believe, as well as what it doth? And when it declares what it doth not believe, doth it make ſuch Declarations Articles of Faith? The plain caſe is, Thoſe of the Church of *Rome* impoſe things we think as hard and unreaſonable as the former Example: Our Church not only denies its belief of them; but ſignifies it to its Members by a body of Articles which they are to ſign, to teſtifie their conſent: How doth this come to make every one of theſe Declarations an Article of Faith? They are only Articles of Agreement, and not

of

of Faith. And the difference between theſe may be eaſily underſtood. *An Article of Faith* ſuppoſes *a Divine Revelation*, as the Replier yields; but if Men offer that for a Divine Revelation, which is not, the rejecting of that cannot be called an Article of Faith; becauſe there is no need of Revelation to declare the other to be none, ſuppoſing there be a Rule to judg what is of Divine Revelation, and what not. That Rule we ſay is the *Holy Scripture*, not interpreted by Fancy, but by the Primitive Church; by this Rule ſo interpreted, we reject *Invocation of Saints*, *Purgatory*, *Worſhip of Images*, *Tranſubſtantiation*, &c. And why then ſhould our rejecting them, be called ſo many Articles of Faith? We own the Scripture for our Rule, and for our compleat and adequate Rule of Faith; and therefore it ſerves us both for what we are to believe, and what we are not to believe. In poſitive Articles, we reſolve our Faith into Divine Revelation contained in Scripture; in Negative, the Article of Faith is, *That Scripture is our Rule*; but from thence it is a neceſſary Conſequence of Reaſon, That we are not to believe any thing but what is contained in Scripture, or may be deduced from thence. Which deductions being within the force of the Rule, are not to be looked on as different from it; and what can neither be proved by Scripture, nor by deductions from it, if our Principle be allowed, we can never be blamed if we reject it. For otherwiſe we ſhould not act reaſonably, nor agreeable to our own Principles.

But as to the Particulars mentioned, we do not meerly reject them as not contained in Scripture, but as repugnant to ſuch Principles concerning Divine Worſhip, Remiſſion of Sins, the Nature of Chriſt's Body, &c. which are evidently contained therein: But I go no further than the Replier leads me.

At the Concluſion of the firſt Paper, there was a Suggeſtion, *As tho' the Schiſm were raiſed by particular Men, for their own Advantage.*

It was anſwered, That the Advantage of the Clergy lay plainly on the other ſide; which is yielded by the Replier; and yet he would have *the Clergy byaſt:* What, byaſt againſt their Intereſt? For that is the Point, Whether they got or loſt by the Reformation? and beſides other Conſiderations, if there were ſo much *Sacriledg* committed by it, as is ſaid in one of the Papers, it is hard to ſuppoſe that they ſhould raiſe the Schiſm for their own Advantage. I am of the Defenders mind, *That matter of Intereſt ought not to be regarded in theſe things*; but when that was ſaid to lie at the bottom of the Reformation, we had reaſon to conſider on which ſide lay the greater Advantage. Reply, p. 28.

The 2*d* Charge is, *That the Reformation hath been the occaſion of a World of Hereſies creeping into this Nation.* With this the 2*d* Paper begins. Def. p. 46.

In anſwer it was ſaid, That either this reſpects the ſeveral Sects of Diſſenters from the Religion eſtabliſhed by Law, and then it ſeems hard, conſidering all Circumſtances, to charge the Church of *England* with them; or it takes in all that diſſent from the Church of *Rome*, and ſo it is a Charge on the whole Church ſince the Reformation, as guilty of *Hereſie*; which was a Charge I ſaid could never be made good.

The Defender avoids the Charge as to the Church of *England*; but the Replier in plain terms owns it; ſaying, *That eſtabliſhment of a Religion by Law, cannot protect it from being a Hereſie*; which I readily grant. And then he adds, *Let him defend his own, and his work is done.* The beſt way to do that, is to conſider firſt what *Hereſie* is, and that I ſaid was *an obſtinate oppoſing ſome neceſſary Article of Faith*; and then, how it comes to be in the Power of the Church of *Rome* to *define Heretical Doctrines*, ſo as that Reply, p. 29.

that any Doctrine comes to be *Hereſie*, by being contrary to its Definitions?

He anſwers, *By the ſame way the Church had Power in her General Councils, to make Creeds, and to Anathematize Hereticks.*

So that whatever Power the Catholick Church exerciſed in declaring Matters of Faith, he challenges as of Right belonging to the Church of *Rome*, which wholly depends on the firſt Point already diſcuſſed; *viz.* That the *Roman* and *Catholick Church* are the ſame.

But I ſhall now wave that, and conſider, Whether if that were allow'd, the Church could now have the ſame Reaſon to declare the Points in difference to be Hereſies, as the Primitive Church had the Doctrines of the *Trinity*, and *Incarnation of Chriſt*.

I am of Opinion it cannot; and yet if it could, that alone is not ſufficient to charge *Hereſie* upon us.

And in making out of both theſe, I ſhall argue from the Nature of *Hereſie*, as it is ſtated among their beſt Writers, who agree that there are three Things neceſſary to make up the charge of *Hereſie*. 1. The Nature of the Propoſition. 2. The Authority of the Proponent. 3. The Obſtinacy of the Party.

1. The Nature of the Propoſition; for it is allowed among them, that there is a difference between a *Propoſition erroneous in Faith*, and *Heretical*.

Inititurenim Fides noſtra Revelationi Apoſtolis & Prophetis factæ qui Canonicos libros ſcripſerunt, non autem revelationi ſi qua fuit aliis Doctoribus facta. 1. q. 1. Ar. 8. ad 2. 2. 2. q. 1. *Art.* 5. *ad* 2.

But for our better underſtanding this matter, I ſhall ſet down ſomething very pertinently obſerved by *Aquinas* and others.

1. *Aquinas* ſaith, *That Faith in us depends upon Divine Revelation, not ſuch as is made to any Perſon, but that which was made to the Prophets and Apoſtles, which is preſerved in the Canonical Books; and therefore* he ſaith, *the proofs from Scripture are neceſſary and convincing; thoſe from other Authorities are but probable:* Which is a Teſtimony of great Conſequence in this matter; for from hence it appears, that whatſoever Article of Faith is made neceſſary to be believed, muſt be proved from *Scripture*; and *Hereſie* being an obſtinate oppoſing a neceſſary Article of Faith, there can be no *Hereſie*, where the Doctrine is not founded on Scripture: And elſewhere he makes *the Principles of Faith to be the Authorities of the Scripture.*

2. That all matters of Faith are not equally revealed in Scripture: *For ſome*, he ſaith, *are principally deſigned, as the Trinity and Incarnation; and theſe are directly againſt Faith; and to hold the contrary to them*, eſpecially *with obſtinacy, is Hereſie; but there are others which are indirectly againſt Faith; from whence ſomething follows which overthrows Faith; as, for any one to deny that* Samuel *was the Son of* Helcanah, *the Conſequence would be, that the Scripture was falſe.*

1 q. 32. *art.* 4.

3. He makes a diſtinction *between thoſe who diſcern the Repugnancy, and continue obſtinate, and thoſe who do not; not intending to maintain any thing contrary to Faith; and in this caſe there may be an erroneous opinion in Faith, without Hereſie.* So that an erroneous Opinion lies in not attending to the Conſequence of that Opinion, as againſt Faith, and not maintaining it obſtinately. But he aſſerts it *to be in the Churches Power to declare ſuch an Opinion to be againſt Faith, and then he makes it Heretical to deny it:* His Inſtance is about *the five Notions of the Trinity*; and his Concluſion is, *That it cannot be Heretical in it ſelf to have different Opinions about them*, but it is very hard to underſtand how the Church by its declaration can make the holding one or the other Opinion to be more or leſs repugnant to Faith. But then the Reaſon of *Hereſie* muſt be reſolved into the *Authority* of the *Church*; of which afterwards; yet ſtill *Scripture* is the Rule by which the Church is to judg.

(4.) *That*

(4.) *That there are ſome things revealed in Scripture which immediately tend to make mankind happy; and thoſe are the Articles of Faith which all Men are bound to believe explicitely; other things are revealed by accident, or ſecondarily, as that* Abraham *had two Sons, that* David *was the Son of* Jeſſe. *Now as to theſe latter points he ſaith, That it is enough to have an inward preparation of mind to believe all that is contained in Scripture; and thoſe things in particular as ſoon as they are known to be there.* But we believe all Perſons bound to ſearch the Scriptures, that they may know what is contained therein. However we gain this Point hereby, that by their own Doctrine, beſides the Articles of Faith receiv'd on both ſides, no other Points can become neceſſary, till they be made appear to us to be contained *in Scripture*, otherwiſe it is ſufficient for us to be ready to believe whatever is contained therein. And conſequently, we cannot be charged with *Hereſie* for rejecting them. 2.2.q.2. art.5.

*Alphonſus a Caſtro* makes this diſtinction between *Hereſie* and a *Propoſition erroneous in Faith*; That the former *is againſt ſuch a point of Faith, as all Men are bound to believe; but there are ſome Propoſitions*, he ſaith, *relating to Faith, wherein a Man is under no obligation to believe either part of the contradiction. But if he aſſerts either of them to be an Article of Faith, and pronounces the other Heretical, he then errs in Faith, and is become a Heretick.* From whence I obſerve, that ſuppoſing any points in Controverſie, not to be ſo determined as to bring on Men an obligation to believe them, thoſe who make them to be *Articles of Faith*, and condemn the others for *Hereticks*, are in ſo doing *Hereticks* themſelves. De Hæret. punit. l. 1. c. 3.

*Melchior Canus* ſaith, *That although a Propoſition be thought by wiſe Men to be a matter of Faith, yet if it be not plainly defined by the Church, nor demonſtrated by Reaſon, then the oppoſing of it is no Hereſie, but Erroneous Doctaine.* Nay he ſaith further, *That if an Opinion do contradict a point of Catholick Faith in the moſt probable and almoſt neceſſary Opinion of all wiſe Men, yet if it do not manifeſtly contradict, it is barely Erroneous, and not Heretical.* Loc. Theolog. l. 12. c. 11.

*Suarez* ſaith, *that* Melchior Canus *his Doctrine in this matter is generally receiv'd.* But he adds one thing more, *viz. That in Hereſie there muſt be the higheſt oppoſition to immediate Revelation; but if it implies only a repugnancy to a bare Catholick Truth, or Theological concluſion*, it is erroneous in Faith, but no Hereſie. The *higheſt oppoſition lies in three things:* 1. *The Revelation muſt be immediate, and not deduced by Conſequence.* 2. *That it muſt be moſt certainly and undoubtedly of Faith.* 3. *That the erroneous Propoſition do moſt certainly and undoubtedly contradict it. For*, ſaith he, *if there be a defect in any one of theſe, it is not an Heretical Propoſition.* Suarez. de Fide Diſp. 19. Sect. 2. n. 13.

Theſe are the *Principles* laid down by their own Writers of greateſt eſteem. And therefore if the Replier think fit to make good his Charge of *Hereſie* againſt the Church of *England*, he may from hence ſee what he hath to do.

1. He muſt prove the Points in Controverſie to be of immediate Divine Revelation; and not drawn from thence by Conſequences and Suppoſitions.

2. That the Doctrine of our Church doth in the higheſt, plaineſt, and moſt certain manner contradict ſuch Propoſitions of Faith.

And ſuppoſing it were poſſible for him to do the former; yet if their own *Expoſitor* of *the Articles of our Church* may be believed, he can never do the latter. For he endeavours to prove them capable of a *Catholick ſenſe*. The five firſt he allows for *Catholick* as they ſtand. The ſixth about *Canonical Scripture*, with St. *Jerom's* Explication, is *Catholick* enough. The 7th, 8th, firſt part of the 9th, and the whole 10th, *are very Catholick*. The four next he examines. The 15th needs only a *Gloſs of* St. *Auguſtins*. The 16th

*very good.* The 17th *Catholick*, and so the 18. The 19th only *wants a Gloss*; and so the 20th and 21. The 22d he examines, 23d is allow'd. The 24th being only against a custom of the Church, he proves from *Canus*, *can imply no Heresie*; and yet *he thinks it capable of a good Gloss.* The 25th he allows *in the genuine sense of it.* The 26th and 27th are confessed to be *the Doctrines of the Church, and all the Fathers.* Even the 28th against *Transubstantiation* he thinks *may be glossed into a good sense.* The 29th is explained *from* S. *Augustin.* The 30th from *Canus*, *not to contain any Heresie*: The 31st he saith *only opposes the common Opinion.* The 32d *capable of a sound sense*, 33, 34th *agreeable to Scripture and Antiquity.* 35th about *the Homilies*, *passable.* 36th about *Ordination valid.* 37th *agreeable to the French Opinion and Practise*, the *Popes Jurisdiction* may be understood of *Temporal.* The two last he allows to be *Catholick.*

So that of 39 *Articles*, but five are reserved for Examination, and of these, the 11th he saith, *is about words*; the 12 and 13 *capable of a good sense*; the 14th goes *upon a mistake of their sense*; the 22d *determines nothing against the true Faith.* I do not go about to justifie his *Exposition*; but I say, that upon your own grounds, it sheweth that our Church cannot be justly charged with *Heresie.* For if it be required that such Propositions as are *Heretical* must in the highest and clearest manner contradict *the Doctrines* of *Faith*; and your own *Expositor* grants they do not; then however you may think them *Erroneous*, yet you cannot condemn them for Heretical.

(2.) As to *Heresie*, a *sufficient Proposition* of the matters of Faith is required. For they grant that the matters of Faith must be proposed in such a manner as to induce an obligation to believe them, before any can be guilty of *Heresie* in rejecting them. Therefore it is necessary for us to know what they mean by *a sufficient Proposal.*

Suarez de Fide Disp. 19. Sect. 2. n. 8. Disp. 4. Sect. 2. n. 3.

*Suarez* yields this to be *a necessary Condition*; and elsewhere discourses about the Nature of it. And there he shews, 1. That a sufficient Proposition of a matter of Faith is not barely to deliver it *as a Divine Truth*, but it must be done with such *Circumstances*, that it may appear to be *prudently credible*, *i.e.* so as to see such reason for it, as to put him beyond doubt or fear of the contrary. 2. That it must appear *evidently credible* to be revealed by God, and therefore certain and infallible. 3. That it must appear not only so, *but evidently more credible*, than the Doctrine repugnant to it. 4. That according to natural Reason, the assent to it is to be preferr'd before the contrary Opinion. Now to make good the Charge of *Heresie* against our Church, he must not bring *the Motives of Credibility* for the *Christian Faith* in general, which are owned on both sides; but as to those Points which are asserted by them as matters of Faith, and rejected by us. As for Instance, *Transubstantiation* is declared by them to be *a matter of Faith*; and it is denied by us; and they charge us with *Heresie* for it. We say, it hath never been proposed to us in such a manner, as to make it appear to be a prudent Judgment in us to believe it, or that it was ever revealed by God, or more credible than the contrary Opinion, in the judgment of Reason. Not any one of these things doth appear to us, but the contrary; for we can see nothing of the Credibility, but a great deal for the *evident Incredibility* of it. How then can this matter of Faith be said to be sufficiently proposed to us?

It may be said, *All this is done by the Authority of the Church proposing it*; *and if it be made evidently credible that you ought to believe the Church, then we are Hereticks for rejecting her Authority.*

I answer, That if by the *Churches Authority*, be meant that of the *Roman Catholick Churches Infallible proposing* matters of Faith to us, we are as far to seek as ever, and for our hearts we cannot find this made out with any degree

gree of *Credibility*. We have ſearched all your Grounds, examined your Motives, weighed your Reaſons, (your Miracles we have not ſeen) but we can meet with nothing that ſhould make it a prudent judgment for us to take all matters of Faith upon truſt from her. And if there be no *Evidence of Credibility*, there is no ſufficient Propoſal; and if there be not, there can be no obligation to believe; and where that is not, there can be no *Hereſie* in not believing, according to the judgment of your greateſt Divines.

(3.) As to the Charge of *Hereſie*, there muſt be *Obſtinacy in the Party*; which they all make neceſſary to *formal Hereſie*.

*Aquinas* quotes the noted paſſage of St. *Auguſtin* to this purpoſe, *That although Men hold a falſe Opinion, without pertinacious animoſity, eſpecially if they derive it from their Parents; and do with diligence and caution ſeek after the Truth; and are ready to lay it down when they have found it, they are not to be reckon'd for Hereticks.* 2.2.q.11. Art. 2. ad 3. Aug. Epiſt. 162.

And we do not think a better Plea can be made for us as to this Charge, than what is contained in theſe words of St. *Auguſtin*. But here we muſt obſerve the artifice of *Aquinas*. He ſaw this would never do their buſineſs againſt the Enemies of the Church of *Rome*, and therefore he pretends to give the Reaſon for this, *becauſe they do not contradict the judgment of the Church*; and ſo draws the power of declaring Hereſie to the Pope, as having the chief Authority in the Church. Of whom St. *Auguſtin* ſaith not a word. But however *Aquinas* himſelf requires *Obſtinacy* even in this caſe to make a Heretick. And the *Obſtinacy* is not placed by him in the meer reſiſting the Authority of the Church, but in the manner of doing it.

*Cajetan* there affirms, *that if there be no pertinacy in the Will, there is no Hereſie*. So that if a Man holds an Opinion contrary to Faith in it ſelf, and he thinks he holds right, and doth not intend to diſſent from the Church, he is not guilty of *Hereſie*. And ſo *Cajetan* defines *Pertinacy to be a conſent to an error in Faith, knowing it ſo to be.*

*Melchior Canus* ſaith, *It is the general Opinion of Divines and Canoniſts, that there can be no Hereſie without Obſtinacy. And no Man is a Heretick*, he ſaith, *who doth not, ſeeing and knowing, chuſe a Doctrine contrary to Faith.* Non eſt ergo hæreticus niſi qui videns prudens doctrinam eligit Fidei contrariam. Loc. 12. c 9.

*Suarez* ſaith, *that all the Doctors are agreed, that Obſtinacy is required to Hereſie; and that it is expreſſed in the Canon Law.* So that I need to produce no more to that purpoſe. Suarez de Fide Diſp. 19. Sect. 3. n. 9.

But the difficulty is, to know what they mean by *Obſtinacy*. It is not hard to underſtand what is meant by the word; for *pertinax* is one that is *over-tenacious*, *i. e.* that holds an Opinion, when he ſees no ground for it, or will yield to no Reaſonable conviction; or that hath not a deſire to find out Truth, and ſubmit to it. And ſo it is plain St. *Auguſtin* underſtood it, in the place before mention'd. And in another place, he makes it to lye in *a Mans reſiſting the Catholick Doctrine made known to him, without which he did not judg him a Heretick, though he held Heretical Doctrine.* And again he declares thoſe to be *Hereticks that contumaciouſly reſiſt thoſe that correct and inſtruct them, and will not amend their wicked Doctrines, but go on to defend them.* Theſe paſſages of St. *Auguſtin* are enter'd in the Body of the *Canon-Law*; and the Gloſs there ſaith, *If one holds Doctrines againſt Faith, and be ready to be better inſtructed, he is no Heretick.* The ſame Authorities *Ockam* inſiſts upon, and from them he declares *Obſtinacy* to be ſo neceſſary, that without it no Man can be a Heretick. And he concludes from St. *Auguſtin*, that if a Man be ready to yield to *Truth* when he finds it, he is not guilty of *Obſtinacy*. And he proves that ſuch are no Hereticks from theſe Reaſons: (1) Becauſe *Hereticks* are to be Excommunicated; but ſuch by the *Canon-Law* are not to be

De Bapt. c. Donat. l. 4. c 16. De Civit. Dei, l. 18. c. 51. C. 24. q. 3. c. 29, 31. Ockam Dialog. l. 3. c. 3. &c. c. 6. ad fin. Cap. 8. C. 24. q. 1. Schiſmæ.

Excommunicated. (2) Because they are ready to be better instructed. (3) Be-
L. 4. c. 2. cause many have erred and were not accounted *Hereticks* on this account. *Ockam* distinguishes a twofold *Obstinacy:* 1. *Internal.* 2. *External. Internal* may be known, he saith, by these Rules: 1. If a Man be not convinced by Miracles. 2. If he will rather question the truth of the Christian Faith, than be convinced. 3. When he doth not use means for his own Conviction, but resolves to persist in his Errors, such a neglect argues an obstinate mind.

*External*, of which he gives many Instances, of which I shall mention
C. 5, &c. some, as (1.) If a Man willingly saith, or doth something whereby he discovers his disbelief of the whole Christian Faith. (2.) If he denies any part of the *Old* or *New Testament.* (3.) If he holds the whole Christian Church to have erred; which he by no means understands of any part of it assu-
C. 9. ming the Titles of Catholick and Infallible to it self; for he saith, some say, that whatsoever Christ hath promised to his Church, may be made good, if but one Person in it holds the true Faith; but he declares *that the Catholick Faith may be preserved in a very few.* (4.) If the contrary Doctrine be known to be universally received among Christians, as if one should deny
C. 10. that Christ was crucified; and on this account, he charges *John* 22. with Heresie, for denying that the Souls of the Wicked are in Hell, and of the Saints in Heaven, before the day of Judgment. (5.) If he refuses to be in-
C. 27. formed, being reproved by the Learned. (6.) If he protests he will never
C. 28. alter his Opinion. (7.) If he forbids reading the Scriptures, or preaching
C. 29. Catholick Doctrine. (8.) If a Pope commands an erroneous Opinion to be
C. 30. believed as matter of Faith. (9.) If a Man consents to such a Definition of the Pope, and imposes it on others.

*Joh. Gerson* treats at large about the *Obstinacy* which makes one a Heretick, in several Discourses before the Council of *Constance*; and he follows St. *Au-*
Gerson. To. 1. p. 408. *gustins* Doctrine in saying, *That it consists in not seeking after Truth, and not obeying it when he hath found it.*

Can. Loc. Th. l. 12. c. 9. *Melchior Canus*, finds fault with the uncertain Marks of *Obstinacy* given by others, and he resolves it at last into this, *That a Man holds an Opinion, which he knows to be contrary to the Catholick Faith*; but then he requires, (1.) That he be certain that it belongs to it, and it is not enough that learned Men say so. (2.) That he must know it by an infallible Authority. For otherwise a Mans persisting in his Opinion, may be great rashness and presumption, but it is not *Heresy.* But in case a persons Ignorance be such as makes his Errors involuntary, it doth excuse him from *Heresy*, because that is not a voluntary Error.

Disp. 14. de fide Sect. 3. n. 10. *Suarez*, and others after him, in plain terms make the *Obstinacy* to lie in *not submitting to the Judgment of the Church*; because, while a Man doth yield to the *Churches Authority*, they account him no Heretick. This is indeed an Argument according to their way of declaring *Hereticks*, but we are now enquiring what that *Obstinacy* is, which doth really make a Man such. St. *Augustins* Opinion is reported by *Aquinas*, as the Reason of his Judgment, that is adopted into the Body of the Canon-Law: and therefore, that ought to be the *Standard*, according to which they are to pronounce a Person *Obstinate.* If Men do not with Diligence and Caution seek after Truth, and are not willing to embrace it when they find it, then they are to be accounted *Hereticks* for being *Obstinate.* But St. *Augustin* goes no further; however *Suarez* would seem to to agree with him; But it is worth the while to consider his Doctrine about it.

N. 11. (1.) He affirms, That it is not enough for one *to be ready to submit to Gods Word, either written or unwritten*; but the Submission must be with respect to the *Church*, as proposing both to us. (2.) That

(2.) That those who believe any Doctrine, *because their Judgment tells them, it is the sense of Scripture*; if they therein follow their own Judgment, and not the sense of the Church, they are guilty of such an *Obstinacy*, as makes Hereticks. Ibid.

(3.) That it doth not excuse, *if he be willing to believe the Church, if he sees Reasons and Arguments to move him*; for this, he saith, *is not to believe the Churches Authority as Divine, but* after a *human manner*, which may consist with *Obstinacy* against the Church, as a Rule of Faith. N. 15.

(4.) That it is not yet necessary in order to this *Obstinacy*, to believe the Church to have *Infallible Authority*, for then those must be excused from *heretical Obstinacy* who denied it: but it is sufficient that the *Church* is proposed as a true Church, whose *Authority* he is bound to submit to.

The short of all this matter is, If a Man resolve to believe as the Church believes, a very small thing will excuse him from *Heresy*: but if not, nothing according to *Suarez* will do it: unless it be *Ignorance* as to the Churches proposing. And this is the modern Notion of *Heresy*, which appears to me, to be very unreasonable on these accounts.

(1.) Suppose a Person have a general Disposition of mind to believe whatever is sufficiently proposed to him, as revealed by God, and believes sincerely whatever he knows to be contained in Scripture. I would fain know whether this Disposition of Mind do not really excuse him from *heretical Obstinacy*? And yet this is very consistent with doubting whether the Church be accounted as the *Proponent* of matters of Faith.

(2.) Is it necessary in order to *heretical Obstinacy*, that the Person believes the *Proponent* to be *Infallible* or not? If it be, then none can be convinced of *heretical Obstinacy*, but such as reject the Churches Authority, when they believe it Infallible; and then none of us can be charged with it; for we do not believe the Churches Infallibility. If it be not necessary, then the Churches Infallibility is not necessary to Faith; for in order to Heretical Obstinacy, he must be convinced of resisting that which was necessary in order to Faith; from whence it will follow, that the Churches Infallibility is not required as the Ground of Faith.

(3.) Suppose a Person thinks himself bound in Conscience to believe those Guides which God by his Providence hath set over him; and he believes to be sincere and honest: and these tell him, there is no ground to believe on the Churches Authority, as being founded neither in Scripture, nor Antiquity, nor Reason, is not he excused hereby from *Heretical Obstinacy*?

(4.) Suppose he declares himself ready to believe the Churches Authority, if it be sufficiently proposed to him; *i.e.* with such Reasons and Arguments as are proper to convince him; but after all, he declares, that he cannot see any such. And yet *Aquinas* affirms, *No Man can believe, unless he sees Reason why he should believe.* How then can a Man be liable to *Heretical Obstinacy*, because he only refuses to believe, when he sees no Reason to believe? 2.2.q.1.art.4.

(5.) Suppose he doth believe that which the Church proposes, not meerly upon its *Authority*, but upon the *Reasons* which the Church offers; why must this Man be liable to *Heretical Obstinacy*, for believing upon the Churches Reasons? What a wonderful nice thing is *Heresie* made? It seems by this rare Doctrine, it doth not excuse from *Heresie* to believe even Truth it self, if it be upon grounds of Reason which the Church it self gives. But it must be taken meerly from the *Churches Authority*; and yet that very Authority must be believed on the grounds of Reason, or the *Motives of Credibility*.

(6.) Sup-

(6.) Suppose a Person hath used the best means he could to find out his Obligation to believe on the Churches Authority, and after all, he cannot find any such thing, what Obligation is he under to enquire farther; and from whence doth it arise? And if he be not under any, how can he be guilty of *Heretical Obstinacy*, who is under no *Obligation* to search any farther? For *Obstinacy* must suppose resisting some Obligation.

(7.) Suppose he be willing to believe on the *Churches Authority*, if that Church be made appear to him to be the *One Catholick Church* of Christ, but when he comes to examine this, he finds that he must exclude very great and considerable Parts of the Catholick Church, to reduce the *Authority* of the Catholick Church to that of the *Roman Communion*; how can it then be *Heretical Obstinacy* not to suppose a *Part* to be the *Whole?*

(8.) Suppose he hath overcome this, yet if he should mistake about the Seat of Infallibility, is he not still as liable to the Charge of *Heretical Obstinacy*, because the true Reason of it is, that such a Person rejects that which God hath chosen as the proper means to propound matters of Faith to us: But if he should be mistaken in the true Proponent, he is in as much danger of *Heretical Obstinacy* still. As suppose a Man takes a General Council, as representing the *Catholick Church*, to be the only *true Proponent of Faith*; and therefore rejects the *Authority* of the *Pope* in this matter, I desire to know, whether this be *Heretical Obstinacy*, or not? If not, then rejecting the true Proponent, doth not make any liable to it: If it doth, then there is *Heretical Obstinacy* in the Church of *Rome*, as well as out of it. And so much in Answer to the Repliers Charge of *Heresie* on the Church of *England*.

(3.) The next Charge relates to the *Insufficient Authority of the Church of* England, and that on these Accounts:

(1.) In that it leaves every Man to judge for himself.

(2.) Because she dares not use the true Arguments against Sects, for fear of their being turned upon her self.

(3.) Because she denies an Appeal to an higher Judicature:

(1.) It is urged in the Papers, *That among us every Man thinks himself as competent a Judge of Scripture, as the very Apostles.*

It was answer'd, That every Man among us doth not pretend to an Infallible Spirit, but all yield the Apostles had it. And by being a Judg of Scripture, if no more be meant, than that every Man must use his Understanding about it, that was no more than was necessary in order to the believing the matters contained in it: But if by being a Judg of Scripture, was meant, giving such a Judgment as obliges others to submit to it, then it was denied, that every Man among us is allow'd to judg of it. But yet we own the Authority of the Guides of the Church, and a due Submission to them; but we do not allow them to be as competent Judges of Scriptures as the very Apostles.

This seems to me to be a full and clear Answer.

But the Replier offers some things against it.

*Reply* p. 31. (1.) *That I suppose Men cannot be deceived in understanding the Scriptures; and consequently their Spirit is infallible.*

I never said, or thought, that they could not be deceived; but I said, they must use their Understandings, to prevent being deceived, and must judg of the sense of what they are to believe in the Scriptures, in order to their own Salvation.

But he saith, *Whosoever useth his Understanding in opposition to the Churches Tradition, makes himself a Judg indeed, but not to his own Salvation.*

To

To make this matter clear, we muſt conſider, *That Matters of Faith neceſſary to Salvation*, are of another nature from *Matters of Controverſie concerning the Senſe of Scripture* in doubtful places.

As to the *matters neceſſary to Salvation to particular Perſons*, we aſſert the Scriptures to be ſo plain, and the Tradition of the Church as to the Creeds, ſo well known and atteſted, that no Man without groſs and culpable neglect, can miſtake about them; but in caſe of invincible or unaffected Ignorance, their Errors ſhall not be laid to their charge, and ſo their Miſtakes ſhall not hinder their Salvation: And herein we aſſert no more than we can juſtifie, not only from Scripture, Reaſon, and Antiquity, but from the beſt of their own Writers, who aſſert,

1. That there are ſome Points of Faith neceſſary to be explicitely believed by all in order to Salvation; for altho' they ſay there may be ſuch invincible Ignorance of them, as may excuſe from Sin in not believing them; yet without believing them, they are not capable of Salvation. As to the *prima credibilia*, as *Aquinas* calls them, he determines, *That every Man is bound to believe them explicitely*, as much as he is bound to have Faith; but as to other things, *a preparation of mind is ſufficient to believe all contained in Scripture, and ſo much explicitely, as is made plain to him to be contained therein.* From whence it follows, That by the Doctrine of the *Schools*, every Man is to judg what he is to believe; for his Words are, *Quando hoc ei conſtiterit*, when it is made clear to him; and how can any thing be made clear to a Man, unleſs he be the Judg of it? 2. 2 q. 5.

2. That particular Perſons may certainly know what is ſufficient to their Salvation by the inward aſſiſtance of Divine Grace, without depending on the Churches Infallibility. This follows from what is mention'd before concerning *the Divine Gifts* which accompany Grace. And ſo much is owned by *Melchior Canus*, as to what is neceſſary for every Man as to his own State and Condition. So that the greateſt Divines of the *Roman* Church do yield all we contend for, as to the Matters neceſſary to Salvation. Loc. 2. c. 8. *Concedimus enim liberaliter doctrinam cuique in ſua vita & ſtatu neceſſariam illi fore perſpectam & cognitam, qui fecerit voluntatem Dei.*

The only Queſtion is about *Matters of Controverſie* raiſed in the Church concerning the *Senſe* of *Scripture*; and as to theſe they yield theſe material Points:

1. That an implicit Faith as to what is contained in Scripture, is ſufficient; and that particular Perſons are bound to no more, till the Doctrine be made clear to them, which appears from the words of *Aquinas* lately mentioned.

2. That particular Perſons may disbelieve many things determined by the Church, without ſin. This *Sancta Clara* proves from *Vega* and others: and he ſaith himſelf, *Their Ignorance in ſuch caſes, is either Invincible, or at leaſt ſuch as excuſes from ſin.* And he farther ſaith, *Deus Natura Gratia Probl.* 15 P. 96.

3. That it is the common Opinion of the *Schools*, and of their *Divines*, *That Laymen erring with their Teachers, are excuſed from any fault, and as long as it is out of obedience to their Teachers, it is rather a meritorious Act.* P. 97.

Let us now lay theſe things to the preſent Caſe, and all the Difficulty will ſoon diſappear.

As to the *Matters of Salvation*, they grant that God will not ſuffer thoſe to be deceived about them, who do ſincerely ſeek after the knowledg of them.

As to *Matters of Controverſie*, they are in no danger, if they truſt their *Spiritual Guides*.

And I aſſerted that we owned the Authority of Guides in the Church, and a due ſubmiſſion to them.

But the Replier is not ſatisfied with this, for he ſaith,

2. *That*

2. *That no other Submission is sufficient, but such as Men lose Heaven without it.* This is somewhat hard to understand: Doth he in earnest think Men cannot go to Heaven without a blind Obedience to the Church? Is there no allowance to be made for Ignorance, Education, reasonable Doubts? Is all other submission to Authority in the Church merely *ad Pompam*? But this Gentleman did not take time to consider the Doctrine of their own *Schools*, about these matters, for I cannot imagine he could be ignorant of it.

But the Defender seems to be wholly unacquainted with it, otherwise he
Def. p. 49. could not talk so crudely and unskilfully as he doth, about *Mens Judgment in matters that concern their Salvation.* And he may now see how far their own *Divines* allow particular Persons to be competent Judges about matters that relate to their own Salvation: And therefore I need give him no other Answer, till he hath better informed himself about these things: but we have been upon such a Point as may in some measure excuse him, but not those who ought to understand their own Doctrine better.

(2.) The next Argument to prove *the Insufficient Authority* of the *Church of England* was, *That she dares not bring the true Arguments against the other Sects, for fear they should be turned against themselves, and confuted by their own Arguments.*

To this it was answered, that the Church of *England* did wisely disown the pretence of *Infallibility*, and made use of the best Arguments against Sectaries from a just Authority, and the Sinfulness and Folly of the Sectaries refusing to submit to it.

To take off the force of this Answer, two different Ways are taken.

Reply, p. 32. (1.) The Replier saith, *The Argument is as forcible without Infallibility as with it.*

Def. p. 51. (2.) The Defender saith, *Authority signifies nothing in this Case without Infallibility.*

I shall consider them them both, tho' both cannot stand together.

(I.) The Replier goes upon this Ground; *That the Church of* England *can never justly charge Sectaries with Disobedience to Her, because they may as well cast it in her Teeth, that she disobeyed her Mother Church, whether she were Infallible or not.*

But the Force of this depends upon a double Mistake.

(1.) That the Church of *Rome* hath as much Authority over our Church, as the Rulers of it have over the Members. Which ought not to have been supposed, but substantially proved, since the Weight of the Cause depends upon it. But I see nothing like a Proof produced.

(2.) That the Sectaries have as much reason to reject the Terms of Communion required by our Church, as our Church had to reject those of the Church of *Rome*. But this is as far from being proved as the other.

(II.) The Defender *desires to be instructed, how such an Authority can be in a Church without Infallibility*? I hope he believes there may be *Authority* without *Infallibility*; or else how shall Fathers govern their Children? *But not in the Church.* Why so? Have not Bishops, out of Councils, Authority to rule their Dioceses? Have they not a *Provincial Synods* Authority to make *Canons*, tho' they be not Infallible? What then is the meaning of this? He tells us soon after; *To say a Church is Fallible, is to say she may be deceived.* There is no doubt of that. *And if she may be deceived her self, they may be deceived who follow her.* And if a Church pretends to be Infallible, which is not, she certainly deceives those that follow her, and that without Remedy. But all this sort of Reasoning, proceeds upon a false Suggestion, *viz.* That our Faith must be grounded on the Church's Authority as the *formal*

*Reason*

*Reaſon* of it. Which he knows, is utterly denied by us, and ought to have been proved. We declare, *the ground of our Faith* is *the Word of God*; not interpreted by Fancy, but by the Conſent of the whole Chriſtian Church from the Apoſtles Times. This is our Bottom, or if you will, *the Rock* on which our Church is built. This is far more firm and durable, than a pretence to Infallibility; which is like a deſperate Remedy, which Men never run to, but when they ſee nothing elſe will help them. Had the Church of *Rome* been able to defend her Innovations by Reaſon or Antiquity, ſhe had never thought of Infallibility. It is a much better expedient to keep Men in Error, than to keep them from it; and tends more to ſave the Authority of a ſinking Church, than the Souls of Men.

But he will not let the Church's Infallibility go thus; For he pretends to prove, *That if we take that away, we make Chriſtianity the moſt unreaſonable Thing in Nature; nay, abſolutely impoſſible.* What! whether God hath promiſed to make the Church Infallible or not! we underſtand thoſe who offer to prove the Church Infallible by Scripture; but theſe *Scientifical Men* deſpiſe ſuch beaten Roads, and when they offer to demonſtrate, fall ſhort of the others Probabilities. As will appear by examining his Argument: *Faith requires an aſſent to a thing as abſolutely true; but a fallible Authority cannot oblige me to a thing as abſolutely true; and therefore this would be an Effect without a Cauſe; a down-right Impoſſibility; a flat Contradiction.* I will match his Argument with another; Faith is not an Aſſent to a thing as abſolutely true, upon leſs than a Divine Teſtimony; but the Church's Teſtimony is not Divine; and therefore to believe upon the Church's Teſtimony, is an Effect without a Cauſe; a down-right Impoſſibility; a flat Contradiction. Page 52.

Let him ſet one of theſe againſt the other, and ſee who makes Faith unreaſonable or impoſſible. But I will clear this Matter in few words. I grant that Faith is an Aſſent to a thing as abſolutely true; and that what is abſolutely true, is impoſſible to be falſe: I grant, that a meer fallible Authority is not ſufficient to produce an Act of Faith. But here I diſtinguiſh the Infallible Authority of God revealing (into which my Faith is reſolved, as into the formal Reaſon of it) from the Authority of the Church conveying that Revelation, which is only the Means by which this Revelation comes to be known to us: As when a Man ſwears by the Bible, there is a difference between the Contents of that Book by which he ſwears, and the Officers putting the Book into his Hands.

(3.) The Church of *England* is blamed, *for allowing no Liberty of Appeals to a higher Judicature.*

The Queſtion is, Whether this makes her no true Church; or not to have any juſt Authority over her own Members?

The Replier ſaith, *She makes her ſelf the laſt Tribunal of Spiritual Doctrine,* Repl. p. 33.

I know not where ſhe hath done ſo, ſince we own the Authority of Free and truly General Councils, as the Supreme Tribunal of the Church upon Earth. And accordingly receive the four firſt; which even *S. Gregory the Great* diſtinguiſhed from thoſe that followed, as to their Authority and Veneration.

The Defender had a good mind *to cut off the Church of* England *from being a Church,* becauſe ſhe hath renounced Communion with the Church of *Rome*; but his heart failed him: And I hope he will think better of it, when he ſees Cauſe to prove a little more effectually, that the Church of *Rome* in its largeſt extent is *the Catholick Church.* Def. p. 54.

He argues, *That there muſt be ſuch an Authority in a Church, which may* Pag. 55.

*give a final Sentence concluſive to the Parties, as the Judges do Temporal Differences.* But is it neceſſary for all Churches to have ſuch a Power? Then there muſt be as many Supreme Courts as there are Churches. If not, we deſire to know where the Supreme Court is, and who appointed it? And where Chriſt hath ever promiſed to his Church a Power to end Controverſies when they ariſe, as effectually as Judges do Temporal Differences? For the freeſt and moſt General Councils yet aſſembled, have not been ſo happy; and thoſe we look on as the moſt Venerable Authority to decide Differences in the Church.

Page 56. *But ſtill our Church wants ſufficient Authority*, in his Opinion. Doth it want Authority to govern its own Members? To Reform Abuſes in a divided State of the Catholick Church? To caſt off an uſurped Power, as it was judged by the Clergy in Convocation, who yet concurred in other things with the Church of *Rome*? I pray what Authority had the *Gallican Church* ſo lately to declare againſt *the Pope's Infallibility*, and to reduce him in that reſpect to the Caſe of an ordinary Biſhop? If Abſolute Obedience be due to him as *Head of the Church*, what Authority have the *Temporal Princes* in other Countries, ſometimes to forbid, ſometimes to reſtrain and limit the *Pope's Bulls*. This at leaſt ſhews, that there may be juſt Authority to examine and reſtrain the Pope's Power. And I ſee no reaſon, why the ſeveral Churches of Chriſtendom may not act as well againſt the Pretence of the *Pope's Authority*, as the *Gallican* Church hath done againſt his *Infallibility*; eſpecially, ſince this Gentleman hath told us, *that Authority without Infallibility, ſignifies nothing.* And thoſe who think they may examine and reject his Dictates, may do the ſame by his Authority, the one being as liable as the other.

It was ſaid in the Papers, *That no Country can ſubſiſt in Quiet, where there is not a Supreme Judg, from whom there can be no Appeal.*

The Anſwer was, That the natural Conſequence was then, that every National Church ought to have the Supreme Power within it ſelf. But how comes Appeals to a Foreign Juriſdiction to tend to the Peace and Quiet of a Church?

Page 57. The Defender ſaith; *That a National to the whole Church, is but as a Shire to a Kingdom; and a very natural and conſiſtent Conſequence it is, that every Shire ſhould have a King.*

One would think by ſuch an Anſwer, this Defender is a mighty Stranger to the ancient Polity of the Church. Did he never hear of the Power of *Metropolitans* being ſetled by the Council of *Nice* for governing the Churches, and calling *Provincial Synods*? Did he never hear of many other *Canons* relating to the Power and Frequency of *Provincial Synods*? Did he never hear of the Decrees of the Council of *Epheſus*, forbidding all Incroachments *on the ancient Rights of Churches*? Did he never hear that *Provincial Councils* have declared Matters of Faith, without ſo much as adviſing with the Biſhop of *Rome*? As the *African* Councils did in the *Pelagian Controverſy*; and the Councils of *Toledo*, in the Caſe of *Arianiſm*; which reformed the *Spaniſh Churches*, and made Canons by their own Authority; which were confirmed by their Kings, *Reccaredus* and *Siſenandus*? Did he never hear that it was good Doctrine among Catholick Divines, *That particular Churches might take upon them to declare the true Catholick Faith*? And if ſo, they muſt judg what is ſo. Did he never hear, that in a divided State of the Church, *Errors and Abuſes may be reformed by particular Churches*? And that this was owned and defended by great Men in the Church of *Rome*? If he did not, he was very much unprovided for the handling ſuch a Controverſy;

verſy; if he did know theſe things, he ought not to have ſpoken with ſo much contempt of the Power of Particular or National Churches.

And to aſſert their Authority, is very far from being like *ſetting up a King in every Shire*; for this were the higheſt Diſloyalty to the King, who hath a juſt and unqueſtionable Authority over all the Shires. Let him prove that the Pope hath ſuch a *Monarchy* over all *particular Churches*, before he make ſuch a Parallel again. But the way he takes is rather like making the Imperial Crown of this Realm to be in ſubjection to a Foreign Power, becauſe the Roman Emperors once had Dominion here, and therefore this Kingdom could never recover its own Rights.

But he ſaith, *A Foreign Juriſdiction is hardly ſenſe with reſpect to the Church, for* Foris *is out, and unleſs the ultimate Juriſdiction be out of the Church, it cannot be ſaid to be foreign.* This is a ſhameful begging of the Queſtion, that what they call the *Roman Catholick Church*, is the *Catholick Church*; for if it be not (which I hope I have ſufficiently ſhewn) then the pretended and uſurped Juriſdiction of the *Roman Church* over the Church of *England*, is a *Foreign Juriſdiction.* Pag. 57.

He adds, *That it is impoſſible to re-ſettle the Church among us, without that which we call Foreign Juriſdiction; becauſe Diſſentions in matters of Religion cannot otherwiſe be removed.* Pag. 58.

But ſuppoſe this *Foreign Juriſdiction* be the occaſion of theſe Diſſentions? ſome maintaining it, others aſſerting the Rights of our Church againſt it; Is not this Foreign Juriſdiction like to put an end to it? Yes certainly. For, if all Parties ſubmit, there will be no longer diſputing. But our Queſtion, as yet, is, whether this be reaſonable or not?

I complained of the Inconvenience of Appeals to a Foreign Juriſdiction. He gives us a ſmart Anſwer, and ſaith, *That holds no Compariſon with the Inconvenience of Hereſy.* As tho' it were ſo plain a thing that we are guilty of Hereſy, that it needed no manner of Proof. Alas! what need a Man prove that it is day when the Sun ſhines? We are juſt as much guilty of *Hereſy*, as the good Biſhop was, who, for aſſerting the Antipodes, was condemned by Pope *Zachary.* But it is a comfortable thing in a Charge of *Hereſy*, to find it no better proved. Pag. 59.

He ſaith, *I miſtook the matter of Appeals, and that it was not underſtood with reſpect to Cauſes, but to matters of Doctrine and Worſhip.* Pag. 59.

An Appeal muſt relate to a *Superiour Authority*; and a conſtant Appeal to a *ſtanding Authority*; and whatever the pretence be, the *Court of Rome* will challenge *Supreme Juriſdiction*, where-ever the *Pope* is owned as *Head of the Church:* And then all thoſe Conſequences will follow I mentioned before. If other kind of *Appeals* were meant in the *Papers*, yet they muſt relate to *an Authority ſuperiour to our Church*; which we could wiſh had been more fully expreſſed, that we might have known to whom the *Appeal* was to be made; whether to a *free General Council*, which we never diſowned; or to the *Popes Authority*, which we yet ſee no cauſe to make our Appeals to, eſpecially as to what concerns his own Juriſdiction.

He pleads, *That Supreme Power muſt be Judg in its own Cauſe; for no Authority ought to be ſet up againſt the King, ſuppoſing a Queſtion be ſtarted about his Prerogative.* Pag. 62.

I anſwer; This is a Caſe extreamly different: for in matters of *Prerogative*, the King's Supream Power is not the Queſtion; for his Right to the Imperial Crown is, and ought to be out of diſpute; but all the Queſtion that can be ſtarted, muſt relate only to the Exerciſe of his Power, in ſome particular Caſes, where former Laws made by the King's Conſent, are ſuppo-

ſed to limit it; which the Courts of Judicature take Cognizance of, and ſo are a kind of Legal Arbitrators between the King and his People.

But in the Caſe before us, the Juriſdiction it ſelf, and the Right to exerciſe any ſuch Authority, is the very thing in Queſtion. And I deſire this Gentleman to reſolve me, whether in the late times of Uſurpation this had been good Doctrine, that thoſe who enjoy, or pretend to Supream Power, are to be Judges in their own Caſe? If ſo, then it had been impoſſible for Men to have juſtified their Loyalty to the Royal Family, then very unjuſtly put out of Poſſeſſion. If not, then there may be a pretence to Supream Authority, where it is by no means allowable for the Pretender to judg in his own Cauſe.

Pag. 63. As to *his Appeal to the Catholick Church*; we by no means reject it, provided he mean the Church truly Catholick, as it comprehends the Apoſtolical Church in the firſt place; and then all other Chriſtian Churches, which from the Apoſtles times have delivered down the Catholick Doctrine and Worſhip, which they received from them. But if he means that which is called a *Catholick Church*, but is neither Catholick nor Apoſtolical; we beg his pardon, if we allow no Appeal to it, ſince its Errors and Corruptions are the great and juſt Cauſe of our Complaints.

He runs into a long Diſcourſe about *Church-Security*, and his deſign is to
Pag. 64, 65. ſhew *there can be none without Infallibility.*

Infallibility is no doubt a very good thing, but where is it to be had? Is it not poſſible for Men both to be deceived and to deceive, with a pretence of Infallibility? All that we deſire is to ſee ſome Infallible Proofs of it; without which all the talk about it doth not end one Controverſy, but beget many. And this kind of Talk is, as if a Man were to adviſe with two Lawyers about making a Purchaſe, but would fain be ſecure of a good Title; the one deſires to ſee all the Evidences that belong to the Eſtate, and after the peruſal of all, he tells him, that as far as he can poſſibly diſcern, the Title is very good, and he would venture all he had upon it. He goes to another, and tells him what the former had ſaid to him. And was this all, ſaith he? Would he not ſay, it was impoſſible for you to be cheated? No. And will you venture your Money without ſuch Security? Why, ſaith the Client, what would you have me to do? I will tell you, ſaith he, there is but one way in the World for you to be ſafe. What is that, Sir? I ſhould be glad to know it with all my Heart. I will diſcover it to you, provided you follow my Counſel; and that is, to deal with a Man who hath ſuch a Gift from Heaven beſtowed upon him, that he never did, nor ever can deceive you, and then it is impoſſible you ſhould be cheated: for, all theſe Deeds and Writings, and Lawyers, may deceive you; but if you deal with ſuch a Man, you are ſafe enough. I thank you, Sir, ſaith the Client, for your good Advice; but I pray, where is there ſuch a Man to be found? For, if I cannot find him out, I am juſt where I was before, and I muſt uſe the beſt means I can, and rather truſt to good Deeds and real Honeſty, than wait for a Chimerical Infallibility.

Pag. 65. It is alledged ſtill, *That without Infallibility, we have not Judgment but Fancy.*

Repl. p. 34. And the Replier ſaith, *That in Competition with the Churches Authority all is but Fancy.*

The difference of theſe muſt depend upon the Reaſon we produce; and by that we are ſtill content *the world ſhould judg*, ſo we underſtand thoſe, who are unprejudiced in it.

It was ſaid in the Papers, *That if the Fancies of thoſe who are now for the Church*

*Church of* England *vary, they are ready, or* (as the *Defender* ſaith it ought to be read) *really to embrace or joyn with the next Congregation of People, whoſe Diſcipline or Worſhip agrees with their Opinion at that time.*

I will take his own Reading, which in my Opinion alters the matter very little; for ſtill it implies, that thoſe of the Church of *England* have nothing to hold them to it, but a preſent Fancy, and when that varies, they may as well be of another Perſwaſion; for Fancy, we all know, is a very mutable thing.

But, to ſhew that thoſe of the Church of *England* are not ſo apt to vary their Fancies or Opinions in theſe matters, I alledged their adhering to the Crown in the times of Rebellion.

He anſwers, *That my Zeal for the Church of* England *is wondrous unlucky.* I am ſorry if it prove ſo, ſince I unfeignedly deſign to ſerve her, and there- Pag. 66. fore ſhould be much more concerned, if I ſhould do her Injury under a pretence of Service. But wherein is it? He confeſſes, *The Doctrine of our Church is in this Point very Orthodox, and her Practice in the times of Rebellion conformable to it.* And what was the Practice of the Church then, but the firmneſs of the Members of it? *But many*, he ſaith, *deſerted her and her Doctrine in this Point at that time, ſo many that the Rebellion was peradventure indebted for its ſucceſs to thoſe Deſerters.* But they were *Deſerters* ſtill; and the Practice of the Church of *England* was agreeable to her Doctrine, by his own Confeſſion. How then comes this to ſhew, that it is only a variable Fancy which keeps Men to it? He ſaith, *If thoſe who deſerted her, had ever adhered to her with a Perſwaſion, that they were obliged to believe what ſhe taught, they could not have deſerted her in this Point, who always taught Loyalty; and till they do ſo, there is no ſecurity of adhering to her.*

This ſeems to me to be *a wondrous unlucky Anſwer.* For doth *Infallibility* ſecure a Church againſt *Deſerters*? Have no Men, no Provinces, no whole Nations *deſerted* a Church which pretends to Infallibility? And ſince there may be ſuch Multitudes of *Deſerters*, where Infallibility is challenged, what greater Security can that give againſt them, more than our Church doth? Nay, I think ſo much the leſs, becauſe the very pretence to Infallibility is ſuſpicious and hard to be made out, and every Error overthrows it. And I do not think the Church of *Rome* did her ſelf greater Miſchief, or made more total *Deſerters* by any one thing, than by pretending to be Infallible. For, when ſuch groſs Errors and Corruptions were complained of that one of the Popes at that time confeſſed them, and owned the neceſſity of a Reformation, when the Princes of the *Roman* Communion called for it, and preſſed it very hard by their Ambaſſadors in the Council of *Trent* (as appears by the French Collection of *Memoires* relating to it) when after all, no one thing, as to the Doctrine of Worſhip, could be redreſſed, it convinced the World, that let things be as they would, they would Reform nothing; this made the Breach irreconcileable. For, till the Council of *Trent* was ended and confirmed, there was ſtill hopes of Reconciliation, upon a due Explication of ſome Points, Reforming Abuſes, and leaving School-Doctrines at liberty; but when they ſaw every thing defended, and the Errors complained of, made Articles of Faith, and put into a New Creed, there was no hopes of any Accommodation left. And all this was the bleſſed Effect of pretending to *Infallibility*; for if one Error had been owned, there had been no farther pretending to that.

It is ſome comfort however, that our Church is confeſſed *to teach the Orthodox doctrine of Loyalty, and her Practice to be conformable in the worſt of Times*; and ſo I hope it will always be. But it hath been ſaid by ſome Body, *That we had our Government and Ceremonies from his Church, our Doctrine from*

Luther

Luther *and* Calvin; *and that we had nothing peculiar to our Church, but our Doctrine of Non-Resistance; and much good may it do us.* And we hope we shall never fare the worse for it. This might give occasion to enquire, Whether the Church which pretends to be Infallible, doth teach it so *Orthodoxly* or not? Or whether those who do think themselves obliged to believe what she teaches, are thereby obliged to the strictest Principles of Loyalty? But I forbear. It is sufficient to my Purpose to shew, that our Church doth not only teach them, as her own Doctrine; but which is far more effectual, as the Doctrine of Christ and his Apostles, and of the Primitive Church; which I think ought to have more force on the Consciences of Men, than the pretence to Infallibility in any Church in the World.

P. 67, 68. But all this while it is said, *There is no firm Motive produced for adhering to the Doctrine of our Church.* And this is repeated over and over: As though there could be any greater Motive in the World, than that our Doctrine is no other than that of Christ and his Apostles. And unless you prove this as to the Doctrine of the *Church of Rome*, all your other *Motives* signify nothing to the real satisfaction of any Man's Conscience. For it is agreed on all hands, that our Religion is a revealed Religion; and that this Revelation was made by Christ and his Apostles: and that this Revelation, as to Matters necessary to Salvation, is contained in the Books of the New Testament. What satisfaction then can it be to any Man's Conscience, to be told, such a Church tells me this and that, and the other Point were the Doctrine of Christ and his Apostles? As will appear by this short Representation: You pretend to no new Revelations of Matter of Doctrine? *No.* You have the Books of this Revelation? *Yes.* Are they not legible? *Yes.* *But you cannot understand them.* Let me try; It is for God's sake I must believe, and therefore I cannot be satisfied till I see his Word. *What! will you not believe the Church which delivers you the Word?* I pray excuse me. A Man brings me a Letter from my Father, about matter of great Consequence to me; he tells me, I need not look into the Letter it self, for he was authorized by my Father to tell me his Meaning: Altho' I believe he dealt faithfully in bringing me the true Letter; Do you think I will trust him for the Meaning of it? No; I will open it, if it be only to see, whether he had such Authority from him or not. And I know, if my Father was pleased to write to me about Matters of such Importance, he would write in such a manner that I might understand him; and if any Difficulties arise in Point of Law, I will take the Advice of those who are most fit and able to direct me. But after all, I must know what my Father would have me to do from his own Words, and not from the Mouth of the Messenger. Or if he tells me he hath Authority to deliver other things by Word of Mouth, not contained in the Letter, which I am equally bound to believe with what I can find in it; can any one think I will believe him, unless it appears by the Letter it self that my Father gave him such Authority? Let him tell me never so much, how long he hath been my Father's Servant, and how faithful he hath been to him, and how much he hath done and suffered for him, and what a number of Certificates he can produce, from time to time, of his good Behaviour; yet all this can give me no Satisfaction, as long as the Letter he brings is confessed to be my Father's own Hand-writing; and that it was purposely sent to direct me what I was to do in a Matter that he knew to be of the greatest Concernment in the World to me. Can I imagine one so wise and careful, should omit setting down in his own Letter such important Things, and leave them to the discretion of one that may either mistake his Meaning, or have some Interest to carry on different from mine? And therefore

all

all the fair Pretences or Motives in the World, ſhall never make me believe any thing to be his Mind for me to do, in a Matter which relates to my Welfare, but what I find under his own Hand.

It is to very little purpoſe to quote S. *Auguſtin's Motives about the Church*, unleſs it be made appear that they belong only to the *Church of Rome*; and that they prove the Church *Infallible* in all ſhe teaches. Our Faith depends on the Word of God, as it is contained in Scripture? this Scripture is conveyed down by the Church; but the Church ſtill is but the Meſſenger which brings the Letter, by which we are directed what to believe and practiſe in order to Salvation. Pag. 67.

We do by no means think *the Word of God is made by writing*, as he ſuggeſts; but we are ſure it is the Word of God which is written, which we can never be of any Tradition. *We do not look out for a fallible Judg, to be ſure to have an end of our Differences:* But we hate to be impoſed on, by a pretence to an Infallible Judg, who inſtead of ending Differences, make more. *We do not think it Judgment to affirm, that giving Honour to God, is not giving Honour to God:* But we have not ſuch deep Underſtandings to comprehend how God ſhould be honoured by the breaking his Commandments. Pag. 69.

It is not Judgment in our Opinion to think, *That becauſe only one could redeem us, no Body beſides can pray for us:* But it is no great Wiſdom and Judgment, if God hath appointed but one Advocate in Heaven, for us to appoint him more; or to make our Addreſſes to our Fellow-Creatures in Heaven, when he hath commanded us to do it to his Son. We do not believe *that the Body and Blood of Chriſt can now be ſeparated, or he die again:* But when Chriſt inſtituted a Sacrament to ſet forth the ſhedding of his Blood, that it is meer Fancy to think his Blood being in his Body, doth anſwer the Ends of it. The Apoſtles no doubt underſtood Chriſt's meaning in what he ſaid, and have ſo well inſtructed his Church therein, that we have no reaſon to believe he meant *the ſubſtantial Change of his Body*, in the Inſtitution of a Sacrament. Now on which ſide *Judgment* and *Reaſon* lies, theſe very Inſtances diſcover. And we deſire no greater Liberty in theſe Matters, than to have our Judgments ſway'd by the ſtrongeſt Reaſon; and that I hope is not *building on Sand*. Pag. 70.

The Replier ſaith; *The Infallible Church is as viſible as the Sun*, We are then *wondrous unlucky* indeed that cannot ſee it: I have often rubbed my Eyes, and looked over and over, where they tell me it is to be ſeen, and I can yet ſee nothing like it; although I ſhould be as glad to ſee it as another. I have heard of a blind Man, who pretended to have ſuch a ſagacity with his Fingers, that he could feel Colours; and he proceeded ſo far in it, that ſome *Vertuoſo's* believed him, and were ready to form a Theory of Colours from the ſubtilty of the blind Man's Fingers; but before they had accompliſh'd it, the Trick was diſcovered. An Infallible Judg of all Controverſies looks to me juſt like it; He is to determine Controverſies, not by *ſeeing*, but by a kind of *feeling*. If he produces Reaſon, we may judg as well as he; if he doth not, he muſt feel them out; which is ſo different a way from the proceeding of the reſt of Mankind, that for my part, I muſt be content rather to grope in the darkneſs of common Reaſon, than be directed by the Light of this inviſible *Sunſhine*. Repl. p. 36.

The Defender here comes in with his *Diſh* and his *Stand*; which are Metaphors ſomewhat too mean for ſuch a Subject, and are apt to turn one's Stomach more than Repetition. The Queſtion is, Whether thoſe who allow the uſe of our Judgments in the choice of a Church, have Reaſon to find Pag. 71.

find fault with it in other things; because the Difficulties about an Infallible Church, are as great as about any other Point in Religion?

The Replier again saith; *The Church is a Noon-day Light.* Then, what *Cimmerians* are we? *Tully* questioned, Whether *some God, or Nature, or the Situation of the Place, hindred a whole Nation that they could never see the Sun*? But our Modern Geographers put an end to this Dispute, telling us, there are no People in the World who cannot see the Sun at some time or other. And we are apt to think. if there were such a Sun-shine of the Churches Infallibility, we should be able to discern it, unless the Light of it may be thought to dazle our Eyes; for, we are as willing to find it as they; but the Difficulties about it are such as we cannot conquer. And there need no *Telescopes* to find out the Sun.

Pag. 75. But the Defender will not yield *that there are any such Difficulties about the Churches Infallibility; for he hath but one thing to mind, and that no Difficulty neither, where, or which the Church is.* I hope when he hath considered the former Discourses, he will not think it so easy a matter to find out the Church he talketh of, *viz.* One Infallible Catholick Church.

*But the Difficulties about Scripture are greater; as about the Canon, Translation, and Sense of it.*

The Question proceeds upon a Person who in earnest desires to satisfy himself in this Matter; Whether in order to his Salvation, he must follow the Directions of Scripture, or the Church? And I doubt not to make it appear, that the Difficulties are greater about the Church than the Scripture. That which deceives Persons is, that they rather consider the Difficulties after the Choice, than before. It is very true, those who trust the Church, have no more to do afterward, but to believe and do as she directs; for they are to examine no farther, whether it be true or false, right or wrong, Vertue or Vice, which is commanded; the Church is to be obey'd. But those who follow the Scripture, must not only read, and weigh, and consider it well; but when Doubts arise, must make fresh Applications to their Rule, and use the best Means for understanding it, by Prayer, Meditation, and the Assistance of Spiritual Guides. And this is far more agreeable to the Design of the Christian Religion, as it was taught by Christ and his Apostles.

But the Difficulties of the Choice are now to be consider'd; and let us consider what those are about the Church, and then compare them with those about the Scripture.

If I choose a Church for my Infallible Guide in the Way to Heaven, to which the Promises of Christ do belong, then there are these Difficulties, which I think impossible for my mind to get over.

(1.) I must exclude all other Churches in the Christian World from any share in these Promises. And either I must condemn them without hearing them, or examining the Grounds of their Exclusion, or I must be satisfied with the Reason of it; which I cannot be, till I am certain that Church hath justly shut out all other Churches, and challenged the Promises to her self alone.

(2.) I must be satisfied that Christ did intend one standing Visible Church to be my Director in the Way to Heaven. And for this purpose, I must examine all the places of Scripture produced to that end, and be Judg of the clearness and evidence of them, *i. e.* I must conquer the Difficulties about the Scripture, as to Canon, Translation, and Sense, before I can be satisfied that I am to make choice of a Church.

(3.) There is yet a harder Point to get over; Suppose a Church must be chosen: why the Church of *Rome* rather than any other? What is there in the

the Promiſes of Chriſt, which direct me to chuſe that Church and no other? Suppoſe I were born in *Greece*, and there I was told, I muſt chuſe a Church for my Guide to Heaven. If it muſt be ſo, I will chuſe our own *Greek Church*; *No, it muſt be the Church of Rome.* What Reaſon or Colour is there for it? Is it ſaid ſo in Scripture? *No, not expreſly.* But what Conſequence from Scripture will make me do it? *There are Promiſes made to the Church.* What then? Were not our Churches planted by the Apoſtles? Have not we had a conſtant Succeſſion of Biſhops in them? Have we not four Patriarchs in our Communion, and you but one? For what imaginable Reaſon then ſhould you exclude our Churches from any ſhare in the Promiſes of Chriſt?

But now as to the *Scripture*, we are to conſider;

1. That no more is neceſſary as to particular Perſons, than knowing the things neceſſary to their Salvation; which are eaſy to be known, and are clearly revealed in Scripture, if S. *Chryſoſtom* and S. *Auguſtine* may be believed.

2. That what Difficulties are objected about the Scripture, muſt be all of them reſolved by him that believes the Church, (as is already obſerved) but the Difficulties about the Church's Infallibility, do not concern him that relies on Scripture.

3. That the general Conſent of the Chriſtian Church, is of far greater Advantage for the ſatisfaction of a Man's Mind, than the Authority of any one Church, as about the Integrity of the Copies, and the Canon of Scripture.

4. As to Tranſlations, the Unlearned in all Churches muſt truſt to thoſe that are Learned for the particular examination of them; but in general, a private Perſon may be ſatisfied by theſe Conſiderations.

(1.) That Men will not go about to deceive others in a Matter wherein ſo many are concerned; and in which it is ſo eaſy to diſcover any wilful Fraud.

(2.) That ſince the Diviſions of Chriſtendom, there are Parties ſtill at watch to diſcover the Faults committed by each other in a Work of ſo publick a Nature.

(3.) That where a Tranſlation hath been review'd with great care, after ſeveral Attempts, there is ſtill greater Security as to the goodneſs of it. And this is the Caſe of the preſent Tranſlation of our Church, which was with wonderful care review'd and compared with the Original Languages, by the particular Direction of K. *James* I. and therefore deſerves to be eſteemed above ſuch a Tranſlation, which was never made out of the Original (as to the Old Teſtament) nor ever review'd and corrected by it. Which is the Caſe of the *Vulgar Latin*, and of ſuch Tranſlations which are made from it.

I have ſaid, that the Scripture may be a Rule without the Church, but the Church cannot without the Scriptures.

The Replier, like a fair Adverſary, mentions that which looks like an Objection, *viz. That there was a Church before the Scriptures were written*; *and ſome Ages were paſſed before the Canon of Scripture was made and owned by the Church.* Reply p. 37.

To which I Anſwer; That when I ſaid the Church cannot be a Rule without the Scripture, it was upon the ſuppoſition, that the Canon of Scripture had been long ſince owned by the Church, and that the Church derives its Infallibility from the Promiſes contained in the Scripture.

But the Defender goes another way to work; for, ſaith he, *The Scriptures, I ſay, may be a Rule without the Church; that is, without Faithful; for a Congregation of them is a Church.* What! in the Senſe now before us, as it is taken for a Guide! Is every Congregation of the Faithful a Church in this Senſe? Then, well-fare the Independents. And this, me-thinks, makes Infallibility ſink very low. Def. p. 27.

I do not say, *There could be no Church before Scripture*; nor *that they had then no Rule of Faith*; nor *that the Church depends on writing*; these are but mean Objections; but I still say, That where a Church challenges her Authority by the Scripture, it can signify nothing without it. Which is so plain, that I need not multiply words about it.

As to his *Church-Security*, we have considered it enough already; but it would make one mistrust a *Security* which is so often offered.

I said, that suppose Infallibility be found in Scripture, there is yet a harder Point to get over, *viz.* how the Promises relating to the Church in general, came to be appropriated to the Church of *Rome*.

Pag. 73. From hence he infers, *That I have at last found the Promises of Infallibility to the Church there.* Is not this a rare Consequence? Suppose I should say, I know a Book of Controversy in the World, that hath very little of true Reasoning in it; but if it were to be found there, it doth not reach to the Point in hand. Doth this imply that I affirmed in the latter part, what I denied before? Is this finding out true Reasoning *in the latter Period, which was not to be found in the former*? There may be true Reasoning, when it is not to the purpose. So there might be Infallibility, and yet the Church of *Rome* not concerned in it. Suppose the Church of *Jerusalem*, as the *Mother Church*, might be Infallible by the Promises of Scripture; what would this be to the Church of *Rome*? But I never said, or thought, that there were any Promises of Infallibility made to any Church in Scripture: Promises of Divine Assistance and Indefectibility, I grant, are made to the Church in general: but these are quite of another Nature from Promises of Infallibility, in delivering Matters of Faith in all Ages. Yet if this were granted, the Church of *Rome*, as it takes in all her Communion, hath no more reason to challenge it to her self, than *Europe* hath to be called *the Face of the whole Earth.*

Pag. 74. As to his *Sandy Foundation*, I tell him in short, He that builds his Faith on the Word of God, builds on a Rock; and all other things will be found but *Sandy Foundations.*

(4.) The next thing laid to our Charge is, *That we draw our Arguments from Implications, and far-fetch'd Interpretations, at the same time that we deny plain and positive words.*

In Answer to this; (1.) It was shew'd, that in many of the Points in Difference, we have express words of Scripture for us. As, against the Worship of Images, and giving Divine Worship to any but God: and for giving the Eucharist in both kinds, and praying in a Language we understand.

Pag. 75. The Defender *would have me produce the very Words, to shew that the Scripture saith No, to what their Church saith I, or contrariwise.*

He talked much before, that we give the same Answer the *old Hereticks* did; and now I think he hath matched them. Shew us, say they, in Terms, the direct contrary to our Propositions; where the Son was said to be Consubstantial to the Father; or the Holy Ghost was a Divine Person; or the Blessed Virgin the Mother of God; or that there are two Natures in Christ after the Union. Will Reason and Consequences signify nothing, when founded on the Word of God?

But I need not this Answer, for I affirm that the words of the first and second Commandment, of the Institution of the Sacrament, *Drink ye all of this*; of S. *Paul* 14. of the first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, against Publick Service in an unknown Tongue, are so plain and evident, that there is no Command of Scripture but may be avoided and turned another way as well as these. And herein we go not upon our own Fancies, but we have the

the concurrent Senſe of the Chriſtian Church in the beſt and moſt Primitive Ages, in every one of the Points here mentioned.

And whether *we are right as to the ſenſe of the ſecond Commandment; and as to Divine Worſhip in general, as to Chriſt's Inſtitution amounting to a Command, as to St.* Paul's *Diſcourſe:* Which the Replier inſiſts upon, next to the Scripture it ſelf, and the Force contained therein; we appeal to the Primitive Church, as the moſt indifferent Arbitrator between us. Pag. 38, 39.

(2.) I anſwered, That where words ſeem plain and poſitive, they may have a Metaphorical or Figurative Senſe; as when God hath *Eyes and Ears*, &c. *given him*; and *the Rock was Chriſt.* And ſo in the Words, *This is my Body*; it was a Sacramental Expreſſion, as the other was; and the other words are figurative, when the *Cup* is ſaid to be *the New Teſtament in his Blood:* and St. *Paul*, notwithſtanding thoſe words, called it *Bread* after Conſecration.

Here the *Defender* will not bite, the Light being too clear for him; but deſcants upon denying plain words, and ſo runs clear off from the Point, which ſeemed to be chiefly meant by the Paper. Def. p. 76.

But the Replier is a generous Adverſary, and attacks what ſtands before him. He endeavours to ſhew *a Difference between God's having Eyes and Ears*, &c. *and thoſe words, This is my Body, as to the receding from the literal Senſe; becauſe*, ſaith he, *there is an implication of impoſſibility in the one, but not in the other.* But withal he grants, *that if by this be meant the Bread, it would have implied an equal impoſſibility.* Repl. p. 39.

I am very glad to ſee this Point brought to ſo fair an Iſſue: For, if I do not prove by the general Conſent of the Fathers, both of the *Greek* and *Latin Churches*, that by *This* the *Bread* is meant, I dare promiſe to become his *Proſelyte.*

(5.) The laſt Thing objected is, *That our Church ſubſiſts only on the Pleaſure of the Civil Magiſtrate, who may turn the Church which way he pleaſes.*

To this it was anſwered;

(1.) That the Rule of our Religion is unalterable, being the Word of God; tho' the Exerciſe of it be under the Regulation of the Laws of the Land.

(2.) That altho' we attribute the Supreme Juriſdiction to the King, yet we do not queſtion but there are inviolable Rights of the Church which ought to be preſerved againſt the Fancies of ſome, and the Uſurpations of others.

The Replier Anſwers, *That our Religion is built on private Interpretations of Scripture eſtabliſhed by Law; and therefore if the Law be mutable, the Religion is mutable.* Repl. p. 41.

The Defender *deſires I would make it appear, that the Holy Scripture is ſuch a Foundation, as makes the Proteſtant Church unalterable; for the Letter of Scripture is common to all who bear the Name of Chriſtians: And all Alterations of Religion are made upon pretence of Scripture.* Def. p. 78.

To give a clear and diſtinct Anſwer, I ſhall lay down theſe Propoſitions.

(1.) That altho' Humane Laws be alterable, yet the Divine Law is unchangeable, and continues its Force on the Conſciences of Men; ſo that no Humane Law can make that lawful which God hath forbidden, nor that unlawful which he hath commanded. Whatever Change therefore may happen as to the Laws of Men, the Law of God is ſtill the ſame, and its Obligation cannot be taken off by any Laws of Men. As ſuppoſe God hath forbidden the Worſhip of Images, or of Saints, or of any Creature, upon Suppoſition that it is not a Creature; no Law in the World can make this lawful; becauſe God's Authority is Superiour and Antecedent to Man's, and

therefore cannot be superseded by an Act of Men. And this is one of the Fundamentals of the Christian Religion, without which it could never have been practised, when the Laws of the Empire were against it. So, neither can Humane Laws make that true which is against the Word of God, nor that false which is agreeable to it. They can never make *Transubstantiation* a true Doctrine, if it were not so before; nor a *Purgatory* necessary to be believed, unless it be proved from Scripture to be so. So that the Foundation of our Religion, being the Word of God, and the Obligation of that on the Consciences of Men, it must remain the same, tho' Humane Laws be mutable. Howbeit, I do not deny the Magistrates Power *in making Laws for regulating the Publick Exercise of Religion.* But as we have cause to thank God for the establishment of the best Church in the Christian World by them among us; so we are unwilling to put *such Cases* as the Defender doth, when we enjoy our Religion as established by Law: And it would be interpreted to be a mistrust of his Majesty's Gracious Promise to protect it.

Pag. 80.

(2.) Although the Letter of Scripture be liable to Misinterpretations and Abuses, yet the true and genuine Sense of it may be understood; and then there is a great difference between false and mistaken Notions, and the proper Sense of Scripture. This is very strange Reasoning, if Men will infer that there can be no certainty as to the Sense of Scripture, because so many have misinterpreted it. Is it any Argument that the Constitution of our Government is not firm; or that Loyal Subjects cannot be certain of their Duty, because Men of ill Principles have run away with false Notions of a Fundamental Contract, and Coordinate Power? Is there no Certainty in Law, because Judges have been of different Opinions, and determined the same Cause several ways? Is there no Principle of Certainty in the World, because Men have been imposed upon, both by their Senses and Reason? If notwithstanding this, we must allow that we may judg truly of some Things, (or else we must all turn Scepticks) then we desire no more than to observe the same Rules and Caution in judging the Sense of Scripture, which we do as to our judgment of other Matters. In them we take notice of the Causes of Errors, the Circumstances of Things, the Difference of Objects, the Nature of the *Medium*, and accordingly pass our Judgment. And in Things too small for our view, or too remote, we make use of Glasses to help us; but all this while Men do not reason so weakly in these Matters. Do they say that some have been deceived by their Glasses and *Telescopes*; therefore there is no certainty in any of them, and they must all be laid aside; and whatever they talk of Spots in the Sun, and the unequal Surface of the Moon, they are all Fancies and *Chimera's* of *giddy Brains*, and no Men of sense can believe them? If Mankind do not argue at this rate in other things, how come they to be so fatally unreasonable about the Scripture? *The Letter of Scripture*, say they, *is used for this Fancy, and the other Mistake, and a third pleads it for down-right Heresy: Every one thinks he hath the Letter of Scripture for him; and upon that he grounds his Faith.* And what then? The natural Consequence is, that every one would fain have Scripture of his side. Doth it really follow from hence that no Body hath it? Or that there can be no certainty who hath it, and who hath it not? *But every one thinks he hath it.* And what follows? *Some or others must be deceived.* I grant it; *But who shall tell who is deceived, and who not?* I pray let me ask one Question; Are you willing to be deceived, or not? *Who is willing to be deceived?* Every one that will not take the pains to be undeceived, or to prevent being deceived. *What pains do you mean?* Such honest Industry and Diligence which every one ought to take, who pretends he searches for Truth in order to his Sal-

Salvation. And I dare affirm, ſuch ſhall never want Means to attain certainty as to the Senſe of Scripture in what concerns their Salvation.

But ſuppoſe the Queſtion be about *Churches*, how can the Church of *England* aſſure Men that is the true Senſe of Scripture which is delivered by it?

I Anſwer;

(3.) The Church of *England* hath offered all reaſonable Satisfaction to Mankind, that it doth follow the true Senſe of Scripture.

And that by theſe ways;

1. By not locking up the Scripture from the view of the People, but leaving it free and open for all Perſons to judg concerning the Doctrines here taught. Which argues a great aſſurance, that our Church is not afraid of any Oppoſition to be found to the Word of God in the Articles of our Religion. And the contrary is vehemently to be ſuſpected, where Reading the Scripture is forbidden the People, as it is in the Church of *Rome*, if the Popes Authority ſignify any thing; for *Clement* the 8th, did revoke the Power of granting Licenſes, which was allowed by *Pius* the 4th. And I do not ſee how any Confeſſor can juſtify his acting againſt the Pope's Authority.

2. By not pretending to deliver the Senſe of Scripture on her own Authority. If ſhe did require her Members to depend wholly upon her Senſe, without examining themſelves, that very thing would render her Authority ſuſpicious with all Inquiſitive Men, who always miſtruſt where there is too much Caution.

3. By her conſtant appealing to the Primitive Church ever ſince the Reformation, as the beſt Voucher for her keeping to the true Senſe of Scripture. And in truth, one of the greateſt Controverſies between our Church and the Church of *Rome*, is not about the bare Letter of Scripture, but the beſt Interpreter of it. Our Church ſtill contending, that the firſt and pureſt Ages of the Church, next to the Apoſtles Times, did certainly beſt underſtand the Senſe and Meaning of Scripture; and the Church of *Rome* pretending, that the giving the true Senſe of Scripture, belongs to the preſent *Catholick Church*, which they would be thought to be, againſt the plaineſt Evidence of Scripture and Reaſon. As appears by the foregoing Diſcourſes.

The Defender's Cavil againſt the *Prayer* at the end of the Anſwer, would have held as well againſt *Amen*, if it had been added to it. But he was to anſwer all, and therefore the very *Prayer* could not eſcape his Confutation, or at leaſt his putting an ill conſtruction upon it; which was far from the Intention of him that made it, who thinks it a part of *a good Chriſtian*, to be *always a Loyal Subject*.

As to the ſumming up the Evidence in his Concluſion, I ſhall not follow him in it, ſince I think the Cauſe ſo clear in the opening of it, that I ſhall leave it as it is, to the Reader's Judgment.

---

# *An* ANSWER *to the* DEFENCE *of the* THIRD PAPER.

I Have now done as to matter of Reaſon and Argument; the third Paper chiefly relates to Matter of Fact: which, if I were miſtaken in, even the brisk Defender of it, doth me that Right, to ſay, the Biſhop of *Wincheſter* did miſlead me. For *the whole Body of my Anſwer*, he ſaith, *is in effect a Tranſcript from the Biſhop's Preface; that I purloin his Arguments, without* Def. p. 111.

*out altering sometime so much as the property of his Words. That I have quoted him five times only in the Margin, and ought to have quoted him in almost every leaf of my Pamphlet. In short, if the Master had not eaten, the Man (saving Reverence) could not have vomited.* This is a Taste of the Decency and Cleanliness of his Stile; especially in writing for Princes and great Ladies, who are not accustomed to such a sort of Courtship to others, in their Presence. But as coarse as the Complement is, it clears me from being the Author of any Mistakes, and lays the blame on the Bishop, who is not able to answer for himself. Yet, as if I had been the sole Contriver and Inventer of all, he bestows those civil and obliging Epithets upon me, of *disingenuous, foul-mouth'd, and shuffling*; one of *a virulent Genius, of spiteful Diligence and Irreverence to the Royal Family; of subtil Calumny, and sly Aspersion*; and he adds to these Ornaments of Speech, *that I have a Cloven Foot, and my Name is Legion*; and that my Answer is an *infamous Libel, a scurrilous saucy Pamphlet.* Is this indeed the Spirit of a *New Convert*? Is this the Meekness and Temper you intend to gain Proselites by, and to convert the Nation? He tells us in the beginning, that *Truth has a Language peculiar to it self*; I desire to be informed whether these be any of the Characters of it? And how the Language of *Reproach* and *Evil-speaking* may be distinguished from it? But Zeal in a new Convert is a terrible thing; for it not only burns but rages, like the Eruption of Mount *Ætna*, it fills the Air with noise and smoak; and throws out such a Torrent of liquid Fire, that there is no standing before it. The Answerer alone was too mean a Sacrifice for such a *Hector* in Controversy. All that standeth in his way must fall at his Feet. He calls me *Legion*, that he may be sure to have number enough to overcome. But he is a great Proficient indeed, if he be such an *Exorcist*, to cast out a whole *Legion* already. But he hopes it may be done *without Fasting and Prayer.*

Pag. 86. 87. 88. Ib. 125. Ibid. Pag. 85.

If the People continue stedfast to their Religion, they are the *Rabble*; and the only Friends I can perceive he allows us. *My good Friends the Rabble* in one place, and in another, *Our Author knows he has all the common People of his side?* What nothing of Honour, or Dignity, or Wit, or Sense, or Learning left of our side? Not so much as a *Poet*, unless it be *Robbin Wisdom.* I pray, Sir, when was it that all *our Friends* degenerated into *the Rabble*? Do you think that *Heresy*, as you call it, doth *ipso facto* degrade all Mankind, and turns all Orders of Men, even the House of Lords it self, to a meer *Rabble*? *If all the common People be of our side*, we have no Reason to be troubled at it; but there is another thing of our side, which you like worse, and that is *common sense*; which is more useful to the World than School-Divinity. But methinks he should not be angry with *the common People*, when he takes such pains to prove, *That the Kingdom of Heaven is not only for the Wise and Learned*; and that *our Saviour's Disciples were but poor Fishermen*; *and we read but of one of his Apostles who was bred up at the feet of* Gamaliel; *and that poor People have Souls to save as precious in the sight of God as the grim Logicians.* Would not any one take this for an Apology for the *common People*, rather than for the *Dutchess of York*? whose Wit and Understanding put her far beyond the need of such a mean Defence? Could she be vindicated in no other manner than by putting her into the rank of the Persons of the meanest Capacities? But this is another part of the *Decency* of this Defence. He had several pretty sayings, as he thought, upon this Subject, and therefore out they come, without regarding the Reflection implied in them on a Person of her Capacity as well as Dignity. And so he goes on in his Plea *for the Ignorant*, i.e. *for the common People*, as I am resolved to understand it. *Must they be damned unless they can make a regular Approach to Heaven in*

Page 92. 125. 126. Pag. 95. 93. Pag. 93.

*Mood*

*Mood and Figure? Is there no entring there without a Syllogiſm? or ergoteering it with a Nego, Concedo, & Diſtinguo?* This may paſs for Wit and Eloquence among thoſe I think he pleads for. And ſo I am content to let it go for the ſake of my Friends, *the common People.* But this is ſomewhat an unuſual way of defending, to plead for thoſe he profeſſes to deſpiſe, and in ſuch a manner, as to reproach the Perſon he undertakes to defend.

From the *common People*, we come to *Church-Men*, to ſee how he uſes them. And he hath ſoon found out a *Faction* among them, *whom he charges with juggling Deſigns:* but *Romantick Heroes* muſt be allowed to make Armies of a field of Thiſtles, and to encounter Wind-mills for Giants. He would fain be the Inſtrument to divide our Clergy, and to fill them with ſuſpicions of one another. And to this end, he talks of Men of a *Latitudinarian Stamp:* For it goes a great way towards the making *Diviſions*, to be able to faſten a Name of Diſtinction among Brethren: This being to create Jealouſies of each other. But there is nothing ſhould make them more careful to avoid ſuch *Names* of Diſtinction, than to obſerve how ready their common Enemies are to make uſe of them, to create Animoſities by them: Which hath made this worthy Gentleman to ſtart this different Character of Church-men among us; as tho' there were any who were not true to the Principles of the Church of *England* as by Law eſtabliſhed: If he knows them, he is better acquainted with them than the Anſwerer is; for he profeſſes to know none ſuch. But who then are theſe Men of the *Latitudinarian Stamp?* To ſpeak in his own Language, they are a ſort of *Ergoteerers, who are for a* Concedo *rather than a* Nego. And now I hope they are well explained. Or, in other words of his, *They are*, ſaith he, *for drawing the Non-conformiſts to their Party: i. e.* they are for having no Non-conformiſts. And is this their Crime? *But they would take the Headſhip of the Church out of the King's Hands.* How is that poſſible? They would (by his own deſcription) be glad to ſee Differences leſſened, and all that agree in the ſame Doctrine, to be one entire Body. But this is that which their Enemies fear; and this Politician hath too much diſcovered: for then ſuch a Party would be wanting, which might be plaid upon the Church of *England*, or be brought to joyn with others againſt it. But how this ſhould touch *the Kings Supremacy* I cannot imagine. As for his deſiring *Loyal Subjects to conſider* this matter; I hope they will, and the more for his deſiring it; and aſſure themſelves, that they have no cauſe to apprehend *any juggling Deſigns of their Brethren*; who, I hope, will always ſhew themſelves to be *Loyal Subjects*, and dutiful Sons of the Church of *England.*

Pag. 87.

The next he falls upon, is, the worthy Anſwerer of *the Biſhop of* Condom's *Expoſition*, and him he charges *with picking up Stories againſt him, and wraping them up with little Circumſtances.* How many Fields doth he range for Game, to find Matter to fill up an Anſwer, and make it look big enough to be conſidered? But that Author hath ſo well acquitted himſelf in his Defence, as to all the little Objections made againſt him, that I can do the Reader no greater Kindneſs, than to refer him to it.

Pag. 88.

I muſt not ſay, *the poor Biſhop of Wincheſter* is uſed unmercifully by him; for he calls him *that Prelate of rich Memory.* As though, like ſome Popes, he had been conſiderable for nothing, but for leaving a rich Nephew. But, as he was a Perſon of known Loyalty, Piety, and Learning; ſo he was of great Charity, and a publick Spirit, which he ſhewed both in his Life-time, and at his Death. Could nothing be ſaid of him then but *that Prelate of rich Memory*? Or, he had a mind to tell us he was no *Poet*? Or, that he was out of the Temptation of changing his Religion for Bread?

Pag. 97.

The

The Bishop of *Worcester* is charged with down-right Prevarication, *i. e.* *being in his Heart for the Church of* Rome, *but for mean Reasons continuing in the Communion of the Church of* England. *Therefore*, saith he, *take him Topham. And now what can I do more for the poor Bishop?* The most he will allow him is, *that he was a peaceable old Gentleman, who only desired to possess his Conscience and his Bishoprick in Peace without Offence to any Man, either of the Catholick Church, or that of* England. Yet he hath so much kindness left for the *poor Bishop*, that for his sake he goes about to defend, *that a Man may be a true Member of the Church of* England, *who asserts both Churches to be so far Parts of the Catholick Church, that there is no Necessity of going from one Church to another to be saved.*

Pag. 104, 105, &c. 108, 109. Pag. 109.

This is a very surprising Argument from a *new Convert*. Why might he not then have continued still in the Communion of this Church, tho' he might look on the Church of *Rome* as part of the Catholick Church? The Reason I gave against it was, that every true Member of this Church must own the Doctrine of it contained in the Articles and Homilies; which charge the Church of *Rome* with such Errors and unlawful Practices, as no Man who believes them to be such, can continue in the Communion of that Church; and therefore he must believe a Necessity of the forsaking of one Communion for the other; and that no true Member of this Church can, with a good Conscience, leave this Church and embrace the other.

Let us now see what a Talent he hath at *Ergoteering*. *If this be true*, saith he, *then to be a Member of the Church of* England, *one must assert that either both Churches are not Parts of the Catholick, or that they are so Parts, that there is a necessity of going from one to another.* He would be a strange Member of the Church of *England*, who should hold that both *Churches* are not *Parts* of the *Catholick*; for then he must deny that *Parts* are *Parts*; for every true *Church* is so far a Part of the *Catholick Church*. Therefore, I say, he must hold, tho' it be in some respects *a Part* of the *Catholick Church*; yet it may have so many Errors and Corruptions mixed with it, as may make it necessary for Salvation to leave it. *The second*, he saith, *is Nonsense*. How Nonsense? He doth well to hope that Men may be saved that do not understand Controversy; nor *approach Heaven in Mood and Figure*. *A necessity of a Change*, saith he, *consists not with their being Parts; for Parts constitute one Whole, and leave not one and another to go to or from.* We are not speaking of the *Parts* leaving *one another*; but of a Person leaving *one Part* to go to another. Suppose a Pestilential Disease rage in one part of the City, and not in another; may it not be necessary to leave one Part and go to the other, tho' they are both Parts of the same City, and do not remove from one to the other? But he saith, with great assurance, *that necessity of Change makes it absolutely impossible for both Churches to be parts of the Catholick.* Which plainly shews, he never understood the Terms of Communion with both Churches. For, no Church in the World can lay an Obligation upon a Man to be dishonest, *i. e.* to profess one thing, and to do another; which is Dissimulation and Hypocrisy. And no Church can oblige a Man to believe what is false, or to do what is unlawful; and rather than do either, he must forsake the Communion of that Church.

Thus I have given a sufficient taste of the Spirit and Reasoning of this Gentleman.

As to the main Design of the *Third Paper*, I declared that I considered it, as it was supposed to contain the *Reasons* and *Motives* of the *Conversion* of so great a Lady to the Church of *Rome*.

But this Gentleman hath now eased me of the necessity of further considering

dering it on that Account. For he declares, *That none of thoſe Motives or Reaſons are to be found in the Paper of her Highneſs.* Which he repeats ſeveral times. *She writ this Paper, not as to the Reaſons ſhe had her ſelf for changing,* &c. *As for the Reaſons of it, they were only betwixt God and her own Soul, and the Prieſt with whom ſhe ſpoke at laſt.* Pag. 90. Ibid. Ibid.

And ſo my Work is at an end as to her Paper. For I never intended to ranſack the *private Papers*, or *ſecret Narratives* of great Perſons. And I do not in the leaſt queſtion the Relation now given, from ſo great Authority as that he mentions of the Paſſages concerning Her; and therefore I have nothing more to ſay as to what relates to the *Perſon* of the *Dutcheſs*. Page 112.

But I ſhall take notice of what this Defender ſaith, which reflects on the Honour of the Church of *England*.

(1.) *The Pillars of the Church eſtabliſhed by Law*, ſaith he, *are to be found but broken Staffs by their own Conceſſions.* What! is the Church of *England Felo de ſe*? But how, I pray? *For after all their undertaking to heal a wounded Conſcience, they leave their Proſelytes finally to the Scripture; as our Phyſicians, when they have emptied the Pockets of their Patients, without curing them, ſend them at laſt to* Tunbridg *Waters, or the Air of* Montpellier: As tho' the Scripture were looked on by us as a meer Help at a dead Lift, when we have nothing to ſay. One would think he had never read the Articles of the Church of *England*; for there he might have ſeen, that the Scripture is made the Rule and Ground of our Faith. And, I pray, whither ſhould any Perſons be directed under Trouble of Mind, but to *the Word of God*? Can any thing elſe give real Satisfaction? Muſt they go to an Infallible Church? But whence ſhould they know it to be Infallible, but from the Scriptures? So that on all hands, Perſons muſt go to the Scriptures if they will have Satisfaction. But this Gentleman talks like a meer Novice as to Matters of Faith, as tho' *believing* were *a new thing* to him; and he did not yet know, that true Faith muſt be grounded on Divine Revelation, which *the Pillars of our Church* have always aſſerted to be contained only in the Scripture; and therefore whither can they ſend Perſons but to the Scripture? But it ſeems he is got no farther than the *Collier's Faith*; he believes as the Church believes, and the Church believes as he believes; and by this he hopes to be too hard for *a Legion of Devils*. Pag. 94.

(2.) He ſaith, *We are Reformed from the Vertues of good Living*, i. e. *from the Devotions, Mortifications, Auſterities, Humility and Charity, which are practiſed in Catholick Countries, by the Example and Precept of that lean mortified Apoſtle St.* Martin Luther. Pag. 98.

He knows we pretend not to *Canonize Saints*; and he may know, that a very great Man in the Church of *Rome*, once ſaid, *That the new Saints they Canonized, would make one queſtion the old Ones.* We neither make a *Saint* nor an *Apoſtle* of *Martin Luther*; and we know of no Authority he ever had in this Church. Our Church was reformed by it ſelf, and neither by *Luther* nor *Calvin*, whom he had mentioned as well as the other, but for his lean and mortified Aſpect. But after all, *Luther* was as lean and mortified an Apoſtle as *Biſhop Bonner*; but a Man of far greater worth, and fit for the Work he undertook, being of an undaunted Spirit. What a ſtrange ſort of Calumny is this, to upbraid our Church, as if it followed the *Example and Precept of* Martin Luther? He knows, how very eaſy it is for us to retort ſuch things with mighty Advantage; when

for more than an Age together, that Church was governed by such dissolute and profane *Heads* of the Church, that it is a shame to mention them; and all this by the confession of their own Writers. But as to *Luther*'s Person, if his Crimes were his *Corpulency*, what became of all the *fat Abbots* and *Monks*? *But they were no Apostles, or Reformers.* I easily grant it. But must God chuse Instruments, as some do Horses, by their *fitness to run Races.* As to *Luthers Conversation*, it is justified by those who best knew him, and are Persons of undoubted Reputation, I mean, *Erasmus*, *Melanchon*, and *Camerarius*. And as to Matters in dispute, if he acted according to his Principles, his Fault lay in his Opinions, and not in acting according to them.

But whether our Church follow *Luther*, or not, it is objected, *that we have reformed away the Vertues of good Living.* God forbid. But I do not think there is any Church in the World, where the Necessity of good Living is more earnestly pressed. But I confess we of the Church of *England*, do think the Examples and Precepts of Christ and his Apostles, are to be our Rules for the Vertues of good Living. And according to them, I doubt not, but there are as great Examples of *Devotion*, *Mortification*, *Humility and Charity*, as in any place whatsoever. But I am afraid this Gentleman's Acquaintance did not lie much that way; nor doth he seem to be a very competent Judg of the Ways of good living, if he did not know how to distinguish between outward Appearances and true Christian Vertues. And according to his way of judging, the Disciples of the *Pharisees* did very much outdoe those of our *Blessed Saviour*; as appears by a Book we esteem very much, called the *New Testament:* But if I mention it
Pag. 101. to him, I am afraid he should think I am *like the Physicians, who send their Patients to* Tunbridg-Wells, *or the Air of* Montpellier.

(3.) *That two of our Bishops, whereof one was Primate of all* England, *renounced and condemned two of the established Articles of our Church.*

But what *two Articles* were these? It seems *they wished we had kept Confession, which no doubt was commanded of God; and praying for the Dead, which was one of the ancient things of Christianity.* But which of our 39 *Articles* did they renounce hereby? I think I have read and consider'd them, as much as this Gentleman, and I can find no such Articles *against Confession*, and *praying for the Dead.* Our Church, as appears by the Office of the Visitation of the Sick, doth not disallow of *Confession* in particular Cases, but the *necessity* of it in order to Forgiveness in all Cases. And if any Bishop asserted this, then he exceeded the Doctrine of our Church, but he renounced no Article of it. As to the other Point, we have an Article against the *Romish Doctrine* of *Purgatory*, *Art.* 22. but not a word concerning *praying for the Dead*, without respect to it. But he, out of his great skill in Controversy, believes, *that Prayer for the Dead, and the Romish Doctrine of Purgatory*, are the same. Whereas this relates to the deliverance of Souls out of *Purgatory*, by the Suffrages of the Living; which makes all the gainful Trade of *Masses for the Dead*, &c. but the other related to *the Day of Judgment*, as is known to all who are versed in the Writings of the Ancient Church. But this our Church wisely passes over; neither condemning it because so ancient, nor approving it because not grounded on *Scripture*, and therefore not necessary to be observed.

(4.) But his great spite is at the Reformation of this Church; *which*, he
Pag. 122. saith, *was erected on the Foundation of Lust, Sacrilege, and Usurpation. And*
Pag. 117. *that no Paint is capable of making lovely the hideous Face of the pretended Reformation.*

These

Theſe are ſevere Sayings, and might be requited with ſharper, if ſuch hard Words, and bluſtering Expreſſions, had any good effect on Mankind. But inſtead thereof, I ſhall gently wipe off the Dirt he hath thrown in the Face of our Church, that it may appear in its proper Colours.

And now this Gentleman ſets himſelf to *Ergoteering*; and looks and talks like any *grim Logician*, *Of the Cauſes which produced it, and the Effects which it produced. The Schiſm led the way to the Reformation, for breaking the Unity of Chriſt's Church, which was the Foundation of it; but the immediate Cauſe of this, which produced the Separation of* Hen. 8. *from the Church of* Rome, *was the refuſal of the Pope to grant him a Divorce from his firſt Wife, and to gratify his Deſires in a Diſpenſation for a ſecond Marriage.* Pag. 117.

*Ergo*, the *firſt Cauſe* of the *Reformation*, was *the ſatisfying an inordinate and brutal Paſſion.* But is he ſure of this? If he be not, it is a horrible Calumny upon our Church, upon King *Henry* the 8th, and the whole Nation, as I ſhall preſently ſhew. No, he confeſſes he cannot be ſure of it: For, ſaith he, *no Man can carry it ſo high as the Original Cauſe with any certainty.* And at the ſame time he undertakes to demonſtrate *the immediate Cauſe to be* Henry *the Eighth's inordinate and brutal Paſſion.* And afterwards affirms as confidently as if he had demonſtrated it, That *our Reformation was erected on the Foundations of Luſt, Sacrilege, and Uſurpation. Tet,* ſaith he, *the King only knew whether it was Conſcience or Love, or Love alone, which moved him to ſue for a Divorce.* Pag. 117. Then by his Favour, the King only could know what was *the immediate Cauſe* of that which he calls the *Schiſm.* Well! but he offers at ſome Probabilities that Luſt was the true Cauſe. Is *Ergoteering* come to this already? *But this we may ſay, if Conſcience had any part in it, ſhe had taken a long Nap of almoſt twenty Tears together before ſhe awakened.* Doth he think that Conſcience doth not take a longer Nap than this, in ſome Men, and yet they pretend to have it truly awaken'd at laſt? What thinks he of *late Converts?* Cannot they be true, becauſe Conſcience hath ſlept ſo long in them? Muſt we conclude in ſuch Caſes, That *ſome inordinate Paſſion gives Conſcience a jog at laſt? So that it cannot be denied*, ſaith he, *that an inordinate and brutal Paſſion, had a great ſhare at leaſt in the production of the Schiſm.* How! cannot be denied! I ſay, from his own words it ought to be denied, for he confeſſes *none could know but the King himſelf*; he never pretends that the King confeſſed it; How then cannot it be denied? Yea, how dare any one affirm it? Eſpecially when the *King* himſelf declared in a Solemn Aſſembly, *in theſe words*, ſaith *Hall*, (*as near*, ſaith he, *as I could carry them away*) ſpeaking of the diſſatisfaction of his Conſcience, ——*For this only Cauſe, I proteſt before God, and in the Word of a Prince, I have asked Counſel of the greateſt Clerks in Chriſtendom; and for this Cauſe I have ſent for this Legat, as a Man indifferent, only to know the Truth, and to ſettle my Conſcience, and for none other Cauſe, as God can judg.* And both then, and afterwards, he declared, that his Scruples began upon the French Ambaſſador's making a Queſtion about the Legitimacy of the Marriage, when the Match was propoſed between the *Duke* of *Orleance* and *his Daughter*; and he affirms, *That he moved it himſelf in Confeſſion to the Biſhop of* Lincoln, *and appeals to him concerning the Truth of it in open Court.* *Sanders* himſelf doth not deny that the *French* Ambaſſador (whom he calls *the Biſhop of Tarbe*, afterwards Card. *Grammont*; others ſay it was *Anthony Veſey*, *Sand.* de Schiſm. Angl. l. 1. p. 11.

*Vesey*, one of the Presidents of the Parliament of *Paris*) did start this Difficulty in the Debate about this Marriage of the King's Daughter; and he makes a set Speech for him, wherein he saith, *That the King's Marriage had an ill Report abroad.* But then he adds, *That this was done by the King's appointment, and that Card.* Wolsey *put him upon it*; but he produces no manner of Proofs concerning it, but only, *that it was so believed by the People at that time, who cursed the French Ambassador.* As tho' the suspicions of the People were of greater Authority than the solemn Protestation of the King himself.

But I think it may be demonstrated, as far as such things are capable of it, from *Sanders* his own Story, that the King's first Scruples, or *the jogging of his Conscience*, as our Author stiles it, could not come from an inordinate Passion to *Ann Bolleyn.* For he makes Card. *Wolsey* the chief Instrument in the Intrigue. Let us then see what Accounts he gives of his *Motives* to undertake it. He not only takes notice of the great Discon-
Pag. 9. tent he took at the Emperor *Charles* V. the Queen's Nephew; but how studious he was upon the first intimation of the King's Scruples, to re-
Pag. 10. commend to him the *Dutchess* of *Alencon* the King of *France*'s Sister; and that when there were none present but *the King*, *Wolsey*, and the *Confessor*. Afterwards *Wolsey* was sent on a very splendid Ambassy into *France*, and had secret Instructions to carry on the Match with the King of *France*'s Sister. But when he was at *Calais*, he received Orders from the King to manage other Matters as he was appointed, but not to say a word of that
Page 15. Match. *At which*, saith *Sanders*, *he was in a mighty rage, because he carried on the Divorce for nothing more, than to oblige the most Christian King wholly to himself by this Marriage.* How could this be, if from the beginning of his Scruples he knew the King designed to marry *Ann Bolleyn?* But *Sanders* thinks to come off with saying, *That* Wolsey *knew of the King's Love, but he thought he designed her only for his Concubine.* But this is plainly to contradict himself; for before he said, *That* Wolsey *knew from*
Page 10. *the beginning whom he intended to marry.* Besides, what Reason could there be, if the King had only a design to corrupt her, that he should put himself and the World to so much trouble to sue out a Divorce? For the Divorce was the main Thing aimed at in all the Negotiations at *Rome*; other Applications had been more proper, if his Design was only upon having her for a Concubine. *But she would not be corrupted.* If this were the Reason, he must again contradict himself, for he makes her a lewd vicious Woman. And it doth not seem so probable, if she had been such a Person as he describes her, that she would have put the King to so much trouble, and such a tedious method of proceeding, by so many Forms of
Pag. 18. Law. But again, *Sanders* saith, *when she returned from* France, *and was at Court, she found out what* Wolsey *designed.* Which makes it evident, by *Sanders* his own Words, that the Design of the Divorce was before the thoughts of *Ann Bolleyn.* And it seems very probable, that *Card. Wolsey* might carry on a Publick Design by it, to draw the King off from the Emperor, and to unite him with *France.* And the Pope at that time being highly displeased with the Emperor, he might think it no difficult thing to procure a *Dispensation*, the King of *France*'s Interest being join'd
*Acworth.* c. *Sander.* l. 2. c. 14, 17. with our King's. Some have written, *That the Pope himself was in this Intrigue at first*; but seeing no Proof of it, I dare not affirm it: It is sufficient for my purpose, that the first Design was laid quite another way. I confess afterwards, when *Wolsey* upon his return from *France*, saw how things

things were like to go, he ſtruck in with the King's Humour, as appears by the Letters of *Ann Bolleyn* to him: But yet carried himſelf ſo coldly afterwards in the Matter of the Divorce, that it proved one occaſion of his Fall. *Thuanus*, being an Hiſtorian of great Judgment, ſaw the inconſiſtencies of *Sanders* his Relations; and therefore concludes that *Wolſey* was ſurprized with the Buſineſs of *Ann Bolleyn*, after he went into *France*, having notice ſent him by his Friends; and that *Wolſey* wholly aimed at *the French Match*. *Mezeray* ſaith, *The Cardinal could not foreſee the Love of* Ann Bolleyn, *but his Deſign was to be revenged on the Emperor; and he queſtions whether the King were ſmitten with her, till* Wolſey *was ſent into* France; when the King ſo unexpectedly forbad him to proceed in that Match, *cum ſummo ejus dolore*, as *Sanders* confeſſes. From all this we ſee plainly, than ſince *Sanders* makes *Card. Wolſey* the great Contriver and Manager of this Buſineſs, the immediate Cauſe of the Schiſm could not be the Love of *Ann Bolleyn*. Pag. 22.

But we have other kind of Proofs concerning this Matter, beſides *Sanders* his Inconſiſtencies, and thoſe ſhall be from ſome of the greateſt and moſt active Men of that Time, and ſome remarkable Circumſtances.

The firſt is a Perſon of unqueſtionable Integrity, and accounted a Martyr for his Conſcience at that Time; I mean Sir *Thomas More* then *Lord Chancellor*; who after he had delivered to the Houſe of Commons the Original Papers of the Univerſities in favour of the Divorce, he then ſaid, *That all Men ſhould clearly perceive that the King hath not attempted this Matter of Will and Pleaſure, as Strangers ſay, but only for the Diſcharge of his Conſcience, and the Security of the Succeſſion to the Crown.* Which was a reaſon alledged by the King himſelf; and ſeems to have been built on the Grounds which *Charles* the V*th* aſſigned for breaking his Oath which he made to marry the *Lady Mary*, by the firſt Article of the Treaty at *Windſor*. *Lord Herbert* owns that the Emperor, to avoid the Force of this Treaty, had alledged ſomething againſt the Marriage between the King and his Aunt: But another Author, who lived much nearer the Time, doth affirm, *That when the Match was debated in the Spaniſh Council, it was then ſaid, That altho' the Match between the King and his Brother's Relict were not yet diſputed, yet if the King ſhould die without Iſſue Male, rather than the Kingdom ſhould paſs to Foreigners, the Engliſh Nation would diſpute the Validity of the Marriage.* And to confirm this, in Sir *Henry Spelman*'s Manuſcript-Regiſter of the Proceedings of the *Legatine Court* about the Divorce, ſubſcribed by the three Notaries there preſent, the Witneſſes depoſed, *That at the time of the Marriage, the People ſaid commonly, that it was unfit one Brother ſhould marry the other Brother's Wife.* And Archbiſhop *Warham* then upon Oath declared, *That he told K.* Henry *the* VIIIth, *that the Marriage ſeem'd to him neither Honourable, nor well-pleaſing to God.* And he confeſſes, *the People then murmur'd at it, but that the murmuring was quieted by the Pope's Diſpenſation.* So that all the Satisfaction that was given about it, aroſe from the Pope's extraordinary *diſpenſing Power with the Laws of God.* Which was a thing vehemently oppoſed by many in the Church of *Rome*; and the Univerſity of *Bononia* it ſelf afterwards declared, *That the Match was abominable, and that the Pope himſelf could not diſpenſe with it*; and this they ſay was, *after they had read Card.* Cajetan's *Defence of the Marriage.* The like was done by the Univerſity of *Padua*; beſides many others which I ſhall not mention, and are eaſily to be ſeen.

Hiſtory of *H.*8.p. 216.

Servi Fidelis Reſponſio, &c.

So that *the Succeſſion to the Crown* by this Match, muſt depend upon an extravagant Power in the Pope, which the *Roman* Church it ſelf never owned; and the wiſeſt Stateſmen thought by no means fit to depend upon.

The

The notice of this Debate in the *Spanish* Council being sent over to Card: *Wolsey*, seems to have been the *first Occasion* taken of starting the Question about the Lawfulness of the King's Marriage; which *Wolsey*, out of a private Grudg to the Emperor, as well as for other Reasons, was not wanting to carry on, till he saw which way it was like to end. And the Pope himself was willing enough to grant the *Bull* for the *Divorce*, till he made a secret Peace with the Emperor: and it is eaty to see that the Pope went forwards and backwards in the whole Affair, meerly as *politick Considerations* moved him. Which being fully known to so discerning a Prince as *Henry* the VIII, it gave him just occasion to question, whether that Authority were so Divine as was pretended, which in so great a Matter did not govern it self by any Rule of Conscience, but by Political Measures.

*Lord* Herb. Pag. 219. One remarkable Circumstance in this Matter ought not to be omitted, *viz.* That the King's Agent at *Rome* sent him word, *That the Pope's Advice was, that if the King's Conscience were satisfied, he should presently marry another Wife, and then prosecute the Suit; and that this was the only way for the King to attain his Desires.* But the King refused to do it. And when Card. *Wolsey* sent a Message to the King to the same purpose: the King replied, *If the Bull be naught, let it be so declared; and if it be good, it shall never be broken by any by-ways for me.* And when he objected the tediousness of the Suit, Pag. 217. he answered, *Since he had Patience eighteen Years, he would stay yet four or five more, since the Opinion of all the Clerks of his Kingdom (besides two) were lately declared for him:* Adding, *That he had studied the Matter himself, and Writers of it; and that he found it was unlawful, DE JURE DIVINO, and undispensible.*

Thus we have found the King himself declaring in Publick and Private, his real dissatisfaction in Point of *Conscience*; and that it was no inordinate Affection to *Anne Bolleyn* which put him upon it: and the same attested by Sir *Tho. More*, and the Circumstances of Affairs. I now proceed to another Witness.

The next is Bishop *Bonner* himself, in his Preface to *Gardiner's* Book of *True Obedience:* For thus he begins; *Forasmuch as there be some, doubtless, now at this present, which think the Controversy between the King's Royal Majesty, and the Bishop of* Rome, *consisteth in this Point, for that his Majesty hath taken the most excellent and most noble Lady* Ann *to his Wife; whereas in very deed, notwithstanding, the Matter is far otherwise, and nothing so.* So that if Bishop *Bonner* may be believed, *there was no such immediate Cause of the Schism, as the Love to* Ann Bolleyn. And withal he adds, *That this Book was published, that the World might understand what was the whole Voice and resolute Determination of the best and greatest learned Bishops, with all the Nobles and Commons of* England; *not only in the Cause of Matrimony, but also in defending the Gospel's Doctrine,* i. e. *against the Pope's usurped Authority over the Church.* Again, he saith, *That the King's Marriage was made, by the ripe Judgment, Authority, and Privilege of the most and principal Universities of the World; and then with the Consent of the whole Church of* England. *And that the false pretended Supremacy of the Bishop of* Rome *was most justly abrogated; and that if there were no other Cause but this Marriage, the Bishop of* Rome *would content himself,* i. e. *if he might enjoy his Power and Revenues still; which,* he saith, *were so insupportable, that there lay the true Cause of the Breach: For his Revenues here were near as great as the King's; and his Tyranny was cruel and bitter, which he had exercised here under the Title of the Catholick Church, and the Authority of the Apostles,* Peter *and* Paul; *when notwithstanding he was a very ravening Wolf, dressed in Sheeps clothing, calling himself the Servant of Servants.*

*Servauts.* Theſe are *Bonner's* words, as I have tranſcribed them, out of two ſeveral Tranſlations, whereof one was publiſhed while he was Biſhop of *London.*

*Stephen Gardiner* Biſhop of *Wincheſter*, in his Book, not only affirms *the King's former Marriage to be unlawful, and the ſecond to be juſt and lawful*; but *that he had the Conſent of the Nation, and the Judgment of his Church, as well as foreign Learned Men for it.* And afterwards he ſtrenuouſly argues againſt *the Pope's Authority here, as a meer Uſurpation.*

And the whole Clergy not only then owned the King's Supremacy, (*Fiſher* excepted) but in the Book publiſhed by Authority, called, *A Neceſſary Doctrine and Erudition of a Chriſtian Man*, &c. The Pope's Authority was rejected as an Uſurpation, and confuted by Scripture and Antiquity. K. *James* I. declares, *That there was a General and Catholick Concluſion of the whole Church of* England *in this Caſe.* And when ſome Perſons ſuſpected, that it all came from the King's Marriage, Biſhop *Bonner* we ſee undertakes to aſſure the World it was no ſuch thing. *Apol. for the Oath of Allegiance.*

The Separation was made then by a General Conſent of the Nation, the King, and Church, and People, all concurring: and the Reaſons inducing them to caſt off the Popes Uſurpation, were publiſhed to the World at that time. And thoſe Reaſons have no relation at all to the King's Marriage; and if they are good, as they thought they were, and this Gentleman ſaith not a word to diſprove them, then the Foundation of the Diſunion between the Church of *Rome* und Us, was not laid *in the King's inordinate Paſſion*, but on juſt and ſufficient Reaſons.

Thus it appears, that this Gentleman hath by no means proved two parts of his Aſſertion, *viz. That our Reformation was erected on the Foundations of Luſt and Uſurpation.*

But our *grim Logician* proceeds from Immediate and Original, to *Concomitant Cauſes*; which, he ſaith, were *Revenge*, *Ambition*, *and Covetouſneſs.* But the Skill of *Logicians* uſed to lie in *proving*; but this is not our Author's Talent, for not a word is produced to that purpoſe. If bold Sayings, and confident Declamations will do the Buſineſs, he is never unprovided; but if you expect any Reaſon from him, he begs your Pardon; he finds how ill the Character of a *grim Logician* ſuits with his Inclination. However, he takes a leap from *Cauſes* to *Effects*; and here he tells us, *the immediate Effects of this Schiſm, were Sacrilege, and a bloody Perſecution, of ſuch as denied the King's Supremacy in Matters wholly Spiritual, which no Layman, no King of* Iſrael *ever exerciſed.* Pag. 118.

What the *Supremacy* was, is beſt underſtood by the Book publiſhed by the King's Order, and drawn up by the Biſhops of that Time. By which it appears, that the main thing inſiſted on was, rejecting *the Pope's Authority*; and as to the poſitive Part, it lies in theſe things. 1. *In defending and Protecting the Church.* 2. *In overſeeing the Biſhops and Prieſts in the execution of their Office.* 3. *In Reforming the Church to the old Limits and priſtine Eſtate of that Power which was given to them by Chriſt, and uſed in the Primitive Church. For it is out of doubt*, ſaith that Book, *that Chriſt's Faith was then moſt pure and firm, and the Scriptures of God were then beſt underſtood, and Vertue did then moſt abound and excel: And therefore it muſt needs follow, that the Cuſtoms and Ordinances then uſed and made, be more conform and agreeable unto the true Doctrine of Chriſt, and more conducing unto the edifying and benefit of the Church of Chriſt, than any Cuſtom or Laws uſed or made by the Biſhop of* Rome, *or any other addicted to that See and uſurped Power ſince that time.*

This Book was publiſhed with the King's Declaration before it. And therefore we have reaſon to look on the *Supremacy* to be taken as it is there explained.

plained. And what is there now *so wholly Spiritual, that no Layman, or King of* Israel, *ever exercised in this Supremacy?* But this Writer never took the pains to search into these things, and therefore talks so at random about them.

As to the *Persecutions* that followed, it is well known that both sides blame K. *Hen.* VIII. for his Severity; and therefore this cannot be laid to the Charge of his Separation. For the other Effect of *Sacrilege*, I do not see how this follows from the Reformation: For although some Uses might cease by the Doctrines of it, as Monks to pray the Dead out of *Purgatory*; yet there were others to have employed the Church Lands about, as some of them were in founding *New Bishopricks*, &c. And I have nothing to say in justification of any Abuses committed that way; only that the King and Parliament could not discern the difference between greater and lesser as to the Point of *Sacrilege*; and since the Pope had shewed them the way, by granting *Bulls for the dissolution of the lesser Monasteries*, they thought, since the Pope's Power was taken away, they might with as little *Sacrilege* dissolve the rest. I will shut up this with the words of Archbishop *Laud*; *But if there have been any wilful and gross Errors, not so much in Opinion as Fact, (Sacrilege too often pretending to reform Superstition) that's the Crime of the Reformers, not of the Reformation, and they are long since gone to God to answer it, to whom I leave them.*

*Conference*, Sect. 24. p. 156.

The Method I proposed for Satisfaction of Conscience about the Reformation, was to consider, Whether there were not sufficient cause for it? Whether there were not sufficient Authority? And whether the Proceedings of our Reformation were not justifiable by the Rules of Scripture, and the Ancient Church? He tells me, *he may safely join issue with me upon all three Points, and conclude in the Negative.* But upon second Thoughts, he finds he may much more safely let it alone: And very fairly would have me take it for granted, *That the Church of* Rome *cannot err in Matters of Faith*; (for that he must mean by the Church there) *and that our Church hath no Authority of Reforming her self*; and *that our Proceedings were not justifiable according to the right interpretation of Scriptures by the Fathers and Councils.* But if I will not allow his *Affirmations* for *Proofs*, for his part he will act the *grim Logician* no longer; and in truth, it becomes him so ill, that he doth well to give it over. When he will undertake to prove, that the Church of *Rome* is the *One Catholick and Infallible Church of Christ*, and answer what I have produced in the former Discourses, I will ease him of any farther Trouble; for then I will grant that our Reformation cannot be justified. But till then, I shall think it no want of *Humility* to conclude the Victory to be on our side. And I would desire him not to end with such a bare-faced Assertion of a thing so well known to be false, *viz. That there is not one Original Treatise written by a Protestant, which hath handled distinctly, and by it self, that Christian Vertue of Humility.* Since within a few Years (besides what hath been printed formerly) such a Book hath been published in *London.* But he doth well to bring it off with, *at least that I have seen or heard of*; for such Books have not lain much in the way of his Enquiries. Suppose we had not such particular Books, we think the *Holy Scripture* gives the best Rules and Examples of *Humility* of any Book in the World; but I am afraid he should look on his Case as desperate if I send him to the *Scripture*, since he saith, *Our Divines do that, as Physicians do with their Patients whom they think uncurable, send them at last to* Tunbridg-Waters, *or to the Air of* Montpellier.

Pag. 120.

FINIS.

# AN
# Alphabetical Table
## OF THE
# Principal MATTERS.

*THE Reader is desired to take Notice, That the First Volume of these Works having a Table of its own, is therefore not mention'd at all in this: But the Second having two different Sets of Pages, the Former of them is marked with number* I. *before the Pages, as if it were the First Volume; and the other with number* II. *The rest all follow in their proper Order. But the Fifth having, through the Printer's Fault, three Sets of Pages, the second of them is marked* pp, *and the last* ppp.


A.

*ABbot* Joachim's *Doctrine concerning the Blessed Trinity*, Vol. III. Page 424
*An Account of his Writings*, V. 107, 108
Abbot (Robert) *Bishop of* Sarum, VI. 25
Abel's *Sacrifice, whence more acceptable than* Cain's, II. 178
Abeyance, III. 728
Abiathar *deposed by* Solomon, III. 964
Absolution, *how taught by the Council of* Trent, VI. 496. *Whether only declarative of the Remission of Sins*, 481, 482. *Whether true Contrition required in order to it*, 482, 483. *It was only deprecative amongst the Greeks*, 490, 491. *Whether this power of Remitting Sins, related not rather to Baptism, than to Confession*, 499, 500
Aborigines, I. 349, 350
Adminius's *Tower*, III. 901
Admiralty-*Court and its Jurisdiction*, III. 749
Adoration. *See* Bowing, Host, Images.
Adrian (*Pope*) *sent a Copy of the* Nicene *Council to the Council at* Frankfort, V. 33
Advocates *for Churches*, III. 676
Ægyptians. *See* Egyptians.
Æthelwolf's *Grant of the Tenth of all the Lands to the Church*, III. 771. *Deposed from his Kingdom*, 944
Aëtians, *what sort of Hereticks*, III. 93
Afflictions, *to be born with Patience and Submission*, II. 60
African *Bishops banished, and no others allowed to be consecrated in their stead*, IV. 400.
African *Idolatries*, V. pppp. 53, 54
Agathyrsi, III. 154
Agilmarus, *Bishop of the East*-Angles, *deposed*, III. 775
Agricola. *See* Leporius.
Agobardus (*Archbishop of* Lions) *his Book about Images, published by* Baluzius; *with his Censure of it*, V. 35
Alani, *who*, III. 180.
*St.* Albau's *Miracles*, V. pp. 211, 212, 213
Allegiance, *Whether due to a King* de facto, III. 941, 948, 949, 950, 951, 952, 953, 954, 955, 956, 957, 977. *The Laws the Measure of it*, 944
Almaricus's *dangerous Opinions*, V. 105
Alsop's *Answer to the* Guildhall-*Sermon*, II. 458, 459, 460, 461
Altar. *See* Bowing.
Altarage, III. 679, 691
Alumbrados *in* Spain, V. 117, 118
*St.* Ambrose *alledged for the Catholicism of the Church of* Rome, IV. 294, 295, 296
Ambrosius Aurelianus, *a zealous Repairer of the* British *Churches, and the Worship in them*, III. 205. *Poisoned at* Winchester, 206. *Or perhaps slain at* Charford, 207, 208. *The State of the* British *Affairs under him*, 203, 204, 206
Ἀμέλεια ἢ ἀνθολκῆς, II. 419. *Guarded against*, 420
Amisus's *strange Revolutions*, III. 915
Amyraldus, II. 551, 552
Anaxagoras *the first Philosopher that attributed the making of the World to an infinite Mind*, II. 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42

Anaximander's *Opinion concerning God and the Creation*, II. 36, 37, 38
Andredeſceſter, III. 206. *Deſtroyed with its Inhabitants by the* Saxons, ibid.
Andrews. *See* Biſhop.
Angels. *See* Prayer.
Anger, *to what End and Intent deſigned*, III. 253. *In what Senſe attributed to Almighty God*, 257, 258
Annates, III. 759, 760
Anſelm's *Conteſt with* William Rufus *and* Henry I. III. 776
Antinomianiſm, *from what the Congregational Brethren cannot be cleared*, III. 378, 379. *Some of its Principles*, 379, 380, 381. *The Myſtery of it laid open*, 382, —— 400.
*St.* Anthony *of* Padua's *miraculous Voice*, V. p p 220
Antipodes, IV. 66
Antiquity *on our ſide in the Reſolution of Faith*, IV. 253. *Particularly as to* Juſtin Martyr, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258. Athanagoras, 258. Tatianus, 259. Irenæus, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263. Clemens Alexandrinus, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267. *And others after them*, 268. *And no Antiquity againſt us*, 269, 270, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276
Antoninus Pius *a great Promoter of Learning through the Empire*, III. 133
Apis *thought to mean* Joſeph, I. 372. *Said to be the ſame with* Oſiris, V. p p p. 533, 537
Apocrypha, VI. 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 550, 551, 568, 588
Apocryphal *Books ſometimes deſigned to import ſuch as were not to be read in Churches*, 457
Apoſtles, *What ſort of Men*, II. 284. *The Hazards they ran in preaching of the Goſpel*, I. 172, 173, 174. *What it was that carried them through all theſe*, 175, 176, 177. *They were duly qualified for the Publication of the Goſpel*, 181. *Their Fidelity in publiſhing it*, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186. *Which was the Cauſe ſuch Multitudes believed them*, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195. *How they were called*, II. 284. *When ſent forth, and why not ſooner*, 284, 285. *The Name and Nature of their Office*, 285, 286, 287. *The Credentials they carried with them*, 288. *Not veſted with any Power over the Church upon their firſt Miſſion*, ibid. *The Diſparity between theſe and the Seventy Diſciples*, 291, 292. *They were ſent forth with full Commiſſion*, 299, 300. *Had no ſet Diviſion of Provinces amongſt them*, 301, 302, 303. *What Courſe they took for ſettling Churches in the Places they went to*, 303, 304, 385, 386, 387. *How they followed the Cuſtoms of the Jewiſh Synagogue*, 304, 305, 313, 314. *For ſome time they underſtood not the Extent of their Commiſſion*, 314. *Nor were diſtinguiſhed from the Body of the Jews*, 315. *Formed the Chriſtian Churches out of the Synagogues*, 316, 317, 318. *And followed their Pattern, Firſt, In their publick Service*, 318, 319, 320. *Secondly, In their Cuſtom of Ordination*, 320, 321, 322. *And this as to the manner of conferring it*, 323, 324, 325. *As to the Perſons authorized to do it*, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332. *As to the Number of the Ordainers*, 333. *As to the Effect of this Ordination*, 333, 334. *Thirdly, In forming Presbyteries in their ſeveral Churches*, 335. *Where is aſſerted, that we are not certain what Courſe the Apoſtles took in governing Churches, ſo as to infer the Divine Right of any one Form of Church-Government*, 335. *And this inferred, 1ſt. From the Equivalency of the Names Biſhop and Presbyter*, 335, 336, 337. *2dly. From the Ambiguity of the Places moſt in Controverſy about the Form of Government in the Church*, 337, 338, 339. *3dly. From the Inſufficiency of the Records of the ſucceeding Ages*, 339, 340. *Becauſe of their Defectiveneſs as to Places, Time, and Perſons*, 340, 341, 342. *Their Ambiguity*, 342 —— 353. *Their Partiality*, 353, 354, 355. *And their Repugnancy*, 356. *As likewiſe that the Apoſtles probably obſerved no one fixed Courſe of ſettling the Government of the Church*, 359, 360, 361, 367, 368. *See alſo* Church-Government. *Their Practice herein not obligatary to ſucceeding Ages*, 368, 369, 370, 371. *They did not limit the Churches they planted to particular Congregations*, 570, *&c. In what Senſe they are ſaid to be the Foundation of the Church taught by them*, IV. 86, 87. *Whether the Promiſes of Infallibility made to them are to be extended to the preſent Church in all Ages*, 242, 243. VI. 555, 556, 557, 590
Apoſtolical *Tradition. See* Tradition.
Appeals, *to whom to be made*, II. 233, 234, 235, 236, 237. VI. 651, 652, 727. *To the Biſhop of* Rome, III. 80 —— 90, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806. IV. 386 —— 399, 403, 404. *A Right of Appealing one of the fundamental Laws of Juſtice*, 656. *Appeals to a foreign Juriſdiction a great Grievance*, VI. 652. *Yet pleaded for by the Romaniſts*, 729. *And ſometimes very frequent*, V. p p p. 710.. *A Method preſcribed for proceeding in them*, p p p. 713
Appeals *to the Catholick Church*, VI. 730
*Courts of* Appeal, III. 752
Appropriations, III. 685, 687 —— 693, 775. *Their firſt Riſe here*, 615, 686. *The ill Effects of them*, 650. *How far exempt from the Ordinary's Juriſdiction*, 732, 733

Aquinas's *meaning explained*, V. p p p. 4, 5. *He aſſerts the ſame Worſhip is to be given to Chriſt and to his Image*, p p p. 569.
Arabians, *what ſort of Hiſtorians*, I. 32. 33. *The Religion of the old* Arabs *deſcribed*, V. p p p. 37. *What ſort of Stone they worſhipped*, p p p. 409
Archbiſhops. *See* Metropolitans. *Archbiſhop of* Canterbury's *Juriſdiction leſſened, but reſtored again*, III. 771. *Their ancient Power*, 14. *Were in the Weſtern Churches before St.* Auguſtin, 211. *This Title not given St.* Auguſtin *by* Gregory, 14
Archdeacons, III. 654, 699, 700
Archi Synagogues, II. 308, 312. *They were freely choſen, and not by virtue of any Law commanding it*, 312, 313. *Were in a Poſt of Honour, not of Power*, 313
Arch Presbyters, III. 654
Argæus, (*Mount*) *worſhipped by the* Cappadocians, V. p p p. 413
Arguments *when weak diſſerve a Cauſe*, IV. 106. *As is ſhewn in the Caſe of the* Romaniſts, 107
Arians *uſed tricks to conceal their Principles*, III. 94, &c. *They prevailed but little in the Weſtern Churches, whilſt* Conſtans *lived*, 104, 105. *But upon his death the caſe was much altered*, 105, 106. *Upon what account they were charged with Idolatry*, V. p p p. 455. VI. 95, 96, 97, 98, 99. *They complained of being miſrepreſented by their Opponents*, VI. 516
Ariſtodemus, II. 46
Ariſtotle, II. 49, 50, 51, 52
The Ark, *how capable of receiving all the Animals which were ordered into it*, I. 344, 345. *What meant by the Jews worſhipping of the Ark.* V. p p p. 519, 520.
Arles, *The Council there*, III. 47, 48, 52, 53, 54, 55. *The* 2d *Council there has a remarkable Canon againſt Idolatry*, V. p p p. 415
Artemon, III. 441
King Arthur. *See* King.
Articles *of the Church of* England, IV. 53, 54. VI. 58, 59, 716, 717. *How expounded by St.* Clara, VI. 719, 720
Articles of Faith. *See* Faith *and* Salvation.
Arviragus, *ſaid to be a Britiſh King, but without proof*, III. 19, 20, 21, 22
Aſhton's *Paper left with the Sheriff*, III. 966, 967. *Reflections upon it*, 968, &c.
Asking *Bleſſing*, VI. 169
Aſiarchæ, III. 51. 52
Aſſiſtance. *See* Legionary.
Aſtronomy's *firſt riſe*, I. 75
Athanaſius *flattered by his Enemys*. III. 103. *His Creed (ſo called) cleared from Contradictions*, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, VI. 632, 633. *By whom thought to be made, and when*, IV. 37. *It's firſt and laſt Clauſes juſtified*, VI. 633. *Its Doctrine, as to the Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt*, IV. 68. *Its Articles how neceſſary to be believed*, 68, 69, 70. *An Inference from it*, 604
Atheiſm's *firſt Riſe*, I. 229, 230. *It's Unreaſonableneſs*, 231, &c. II. 80, &c. III. 355
Athelſtan. *See* King.
Athenagoras. *See* Antiquity. *He was againſt the worſhipping any of the Parts of the Univerſe*, V. p p p. 25
Athenians *condemned for Idolatry by St.* Paul, V. p p p. 435
Atlas (*Mount*) *worſhipped by the Inhabitants of Weſt* Barbary, V. p p p. 413
Attacotti, *who*, III. 179
Attrition, VI. 482, 574
*St.* Auguſtin *of* Hippo, *makes none Hereticks for denying the new* Trent-*Articles*, IV. 67. *His Doctrine concerning the liberty of the Will*, III. 124. *The grounds he went upon in his account of Hereſies*, IV. 66. *His opinion concerning the neceſſity of believing whatever the Church defines*, 75, 76, 77. *His preference of Scripture before the Authority of the Church*, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82. *A noted Saying of his, frequently inſiſted upon by the Romaniſts, namely, that* he would not believe the Goſpel, but for the Authority of the Church, 210, 211, 212, 213. *Two other Sayings of his taken notice of*, 275. *And a Fourth*, 331, 332. *His Opinion concerning the Catholiciſm of the Church of* Rome, 298, 299. *His Teſtimony, together with that of ſome other of the Fathers, againſt the Worſhip of Images, Angels, or Saints*, V. p p p. 35. —— 68. *He denies any religious Worſhip to the Martyrs*, p p p. 390, 391, 392, 393. *How he was brought off from Manicheiſm*, p p p. 605, 606
Auguſtin *the Monk challenges a Superiority over the* Britiſh *Biſhops*, III. 221, 222. *Which they abſolutely refuſe*, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226. *Orders ſent him from the Pope*, 222. *His manner of Addreſs to the* Britiſh *Biſhops*, 223. *The true reaſon of their obſerving whether he would riſe to them at their entrance*, ibid. *Not the firſt Converter of the Engliſh to Chriſtianity*, V. p p p. 673, 674. *Whether a* Benedictine, *or not*, p p p. 675, 676. *His Rules very different from thoſe of St.* Benedict. p p p. 677, 678
Auricular *Confeſſion. See* Confeſſion.
Authority *of the Guides of the Church*, V. p p. 54 —— 65. *The Pope's pretended Authority has given great diſturbance to the Chriſtian World*, 138, 139, 140, 141
Auxerre, *The Synod there againſt Idolatry*, V. p p p. 415

# An Alphabetical Table

B.


BAal, Vol. V. p p p. Page 542
Babel. *See* Confusion of Languages.
Bacchus *seems to have been* Noah, I. 370. *Though by some taken for Nimrod*, 371
Baggot's *Case*, III. 950, 951
Baluzius *republished* Agobardus's *Book*, V. 35. *Which he owns was censured by* Baronius *and the* Spanish *Index*; *yet confesses he says no more than the* Gallican *Church believed in that Age*, ibid.
Banchor, *how far from* Chester, III. 127. *Furnished with learned Men at the coming of* Augustin *into* England, ibid.
Baptism *to be publickly administred*, III. 668, 669. *How proved from Scripture*, IV. 101, 102, 103. *The Form of it a standing Argument against the* Socinians, III. 486——502. *Baptism of Infants maintain'd*, IV. 159, 162, 163
*St.* Barr's *Miracles*, V. p p. 214
*St.* Barra. *See* Schotinus.
Bartholomew (*Fryar of* Durham) *his Miracle*, V. p p. 209. *He assists St.* Goodric, p p. 210
Baxter's *Opinion of the present Separation*, II. 560. *An account of some of his Writings*, 450, 451. *His Answer to the* Guild-hall-*Sermon*, 458
Becket, (Thomas) *Archbishop of* Canterbury, V. p p p. 710, 711, 712. *He opposes the Civil Power*, 713. *Was of the same Principles with Pope* Gregory VIIth. p p p. 710, 713, 714, 715, 717. *Broke his Word to the King*, p p p. 717. *Refused to obey him*, ibid. *Appealed to the Pope*, p p p. 718. *Charged the King with Tyranny*, ibid. *An account of his Treason*, III. 826, 827, 828
Bellarmin *weakly vindicated in relation to the Council of* Ephesus, IV. 82, 83. *An endeavour to reconcile him and* Stapleton, 93, 94. *Why displeased at the Synod of* Paris, V. 35. *He grants as great a Hypostatical Union between Christ and the Sacrament, as between the Divine Nature and the Humane*, 49
Bells *made great account of amongst the* Irish *Saints*, V. p p. 212
*St.* Benedict *a despiser of Learning*, III. 128. V. 100. *His Ignorance and Fanaticism*, V. 100, 101, 102. *He is said to be of the* Austrian *Family*, p p p. 643. *His Rule*, p p p. 628, 644, 645. *Not written by Divine Revelation*, p p p. 628, 629, 630, 631. *Taken out of others*, p p p. 633. *Manifest Signs of humane Weakness in it*, p p p. 640, 641, 642. *The Entertainment it met with in* France, p p p. 646, 647, 648. *The* Cluniacks *and* Cistercians *quarrel about it*, p p p. 648, 649
Benedictines, *whether the Converters of the* English, V. p p p. 675, 676, 677, 680, 681. *Whether capable of Priesthood, or no*, p p p. 682. *When, and how that Order came into* England, ibid.
Benignus's *Miracles*, V. p p. 209
Beoanus, *how said to be cured by St.* Ita, V. p p. 210
Beornredus, *King of* Mercia *deposed*, III. 944
Berengarius's *two Recantations*, VI. 429, 430
*St.* Berinthus's *delightful Island*, V. p p. 214
Bern. *The notorious Imposture of the* Dominicans *there*, V. p p. 242, 241, 242
*St.* Bernac's *Miracles*, V. p p. 208
*St.* Bernard *examined as to a Passage of his*, IV. 330, 331
Berosus, I. 28. *His History*, 29. *The time of its writing*, 33, 34
Bertha, *Queen to* Ethelbert, *King of* Kent, V. p p p. 673. *The Conversion of the* Saxons *owing to her*, ibid.
Bertram's *Doctrine concerning the Real Presence in the Eucharist*, VI. 20. De Marca's *Errour concerning him detected*, 21. *As also* Perron's, Mauguin's, Cellotius's *and* Arnaud's, 21, 22
*Dr.* Beveridge's *Refusal of the Bishoprick of* Bath *and* Wells, *upon what Reasons*, III. 959, 960. *The Scandal and Folly of it*, 960, 961. *Whether he could think it unlawful to accept such a Bishoprick*, 962. *His Case compared with that of* George *of* Cappadocia, 962, 963, 964
Beza, *of the Power of Excommunication*, II. 597
Bibles *of* Sixtus V. *and* Clement VIII. *how different*, IV. 207, 208. *The vulgar Translation of the Bible*, VI. 551, 552, 588, 735
Bibliotheca Capitolina, III. 132
Birinus, *first Preacher of Christianity amongst the* West Saxons, V. p p p. 683
Bishops. *See* Episcopacy, Names, Temporalities.
Bishops *banished*. *See* African.
Bishop Andrews, *of the Sacrifice of the Mass*, VI. 179. *Bishop* Blandford's *Discourse said to be had with the Dutchess of* York, VI. 657, 658, 742. *Bishop of* Meaux's *Book*, 708, 709. *Bishop* Morley, 741
Bishops, *how anciently chosen*, III. 60, 61. *No reason to question a Succession of Bishops in this Nation from the first founding of the* British *Church*, II. 48, 49, 50, 51, 52. *Bishops owned by St.* Jerom *to be the Apostles Successors*, 621, 622. *And very justly*, 622. *Their Duty as such*, 622, 623. *Their Authority over the Presbyters*, 635, 636, 637, 699,

699, 701, 702. *Their several Officers or Assistants*, 654. *Their Courts*, 654, 655. *They have the Right of admitting the Presentee to a Benefice*, 724, 725, 726. *And a Right of Collation upon lapse*, 726, 727. *And again of making an avoidance by Deprivation, or Resignation*, 727. *May refuse to accept a Resignation*, 731. *Fourteen Popish Bishops deposed in Queen* Elizabeth's *Reign*, 766. *The Pope threatens to Excommunicate the Bishops*, V. p p p. 730. *Bishops and Sheriffs sat together, by the Laws of* Edgar, *and* Canutus, *in the same County-Court*, p p p. 715. *Bishops may in some sense be called the King's Judges*, III. 758, 759. *Bishops deposed. See* Tunbert, Wilfrid, Winfrid. *Whether our Bishops may be present in the House of Lords, and Vote in Capital Cases*, 814. *They sit in Parliament as Barons*, 814, 815, 854 —— 864. *Are summoned by the same kind of Writs with the other Barons*, 815. *And have therefore a Right to sit and vote in Bills of Attainder*, ibid. *Have been often comprehended under the Names of Grantz, Peers, and Lords of Parliament*, 845, 846, 847. *Are not forbidden to meddle at all in Secular Affairs*, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820. *The Constitutions of* Clarendon *cited against Bishops voting in Capital Cases*, 820. *But to no purpose*, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828. *A Statute of the* 11*th of* Richard *II. urged against it*, 828, 829. *But to as little purpose as the former*, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834. *Several Precedents relating to it considered*, 838 —— 854. *Whether Bishops are to be tried by their Peers, or a common Jury*, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863. *Whether they sit in Parliament as a Third Estate, or not*, 864 —— 876. *Intrusion falsly charged upon Queen* Elizabeth's *Bishops*, IV. 366, 367, 368. *The Power of deposing Bishops was in a Provincial Synod*, 384, 385. *Of the Title of Universal Bishop. See* Pope. *Asking a Bishop's Blessing. See* Asking. *No reason to question a Succession of Bishops here, from the first founding of the* British *Church*, III. 48. *See* British.

Binding *and Loosing*, II. 290. *How understood by the* Jewish Rabbies, 309

Blandford. *See* Bishop.

Blessing. *See* Asking.

Blood, *whether to be eaten by Christians*, II. 370

Bocland, III. 754

Body, *determined to a place*, VI. 633, 634

Bolleyn (Ann) VI. 746

Bonaventure's *Psalter*, VI. 630

Bonds *of Resignation. See* Resignation.

Boniface's *pretty Miracles*, V. p p p. 226

Boniface VIIIth's *Proof, that there must be but one Chief Priest, and so but one Pope*, II. 201

Books, *why sold here at better Rates than in our Neighbour-Countrys*, VI. 38

Bowing *at the Name of* Jesus, II. 633, 634. *Towards the Altar*, V. 41. p p p. 573, 574, 575. VI. 69, 70, 71, 74, 75, 76, 77, 91, 92, 115

Brachman's *Religion*, V. p p p. 39. *And manner of Worship*, p p p. 412

Bracthan, *a Stone about which are several fabulous Traditions*, V. p p p. 409, 410

Braga; *the Council there has a remarkable Canon against Idolatry*, V. p p p. 415

*St.* Brendan's *Miracles*, V. p p. 214, 215

*St.* Brigit's *Revelations*, V. 94, 99. *Contrary to St.* Catharine's, 95, 96. *Her Blasphemy*, 104

Bretagn *in* France, III. 218. *How the* Britains *seem to have first settled there*, 218, 219, 220

Bristol, III. 909

Britain, *how far conquered by* Julius Cæsar, III. 900. *Whence so called*, 920. *Invaded on the South by the* Scots *from* Ireland, 149. *And on the* North *by the* Picts *from* Scandinavia, ibid. *The* Roman *Province here how bounded*, 151. *The* Caledonian Britains *whence derived*, 153. *The* Southern Britains *from the* Celtæ, ibid. *The* British *Islands, and some of the* Celtæ *renounced the* Roman *Empire, and took up Arms in their own Defence*, 183. *The* Britains *assisted by* Stilicho, 184. *They solicite the* Romans *a* 2*d time for Supplies*, 184, 185. *The* Britains *Wall, where. See* Wall. *Their Complaints to* Aëtius, 187. *Their Legionary Assistance, what, and when given*, 188, 189. *They send for the* Saxons *to come to their Assistance*, 189. *The dreadful Character* Gildas *gives of their Manners*, ibid. *Their Conflicts with the* Saxons, 200, 201, 202. *Their Affairs under* Ambrosius Aurelianus, 203, 204. *They soon fall into Civil Dissentions*, 206. *How converted to Christianity*, 615. V. p p p. 673, 674. Britain, *a place of considerable Trade before the coming of* Cæsar *hither*, 919. *Whether known to the* Greeks *before* Cæsar's *time*, 921. *Not anciently subject to the See of* Rome, IV. 395, 396, 397, 398. *See* Appeals, *and* Pope.

Britains, *why said to be derived from* Brute, III. 172, 173. *When first converted to the Christian Faith*, 2. *A Passage of* Gildas *on this Subject explained*, 3, 4. *Not converted by* Joseph *of* Arimathea, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8. *Not one Testimony reaching this Point, that is not taken from the* Glassenbury *Legends*, 8, 9. *The Testimony of St.* Patrick's *Charter considered*, 9, 10, 11. *King* Ina's *large*

*Charter considered. Whether there was ever a* Britiſh *Church built in the Apoſtles Days*, 22, 23. *Whether the* Britains *were converted by St.* Paul, 24. *He had leiſure enough for it*, 25, 26, 27. *And had ſufficient Invitation and Encouragement to it*, 27, 28. *and was moſt likely to come hither of any of the Apoſtles*, 28, 29. *No evidence of St.* Peter's *coming hither*, 29, 30. *The Succeſſion of this Church proved from* Tertullian, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36. *And from* Origen, 36. *There might be a Chriſtian Church here in the time of King* Lucius, *though not firſt founded by him*, 42, 43, 44. *Whether this Church ſuffered Perſecution in* Diocleſian's *Reign*, 44, 45, 46. *Three* Britiſh *Biſhops at the Council of* Arles, 47, 48. *Some Biſhops from hence probably at the Council of* Nice, 56, 57. *The* Britiſh *Churches not ſubject to the* Roman *Patriarch*, 66, &c. *An account of their Faith*, 108, 109, 112 ——121. *Their Publick Service*, 134, &c. Britiſh *Biſhops at the Council of* Ariminum, 109. *The* Britiſh *Monaſteries no elder than St.* Patrick's *time*, 115. *No reaſon to queſtion the Succeſſion of Biſhops here, from the firſt founding of the* Britiſh *Church*, 48. *Though not taken up from the Heathen* Flamines *and* Archflamines, 49, 50, 51, 52. *The firſt occaſion of the Declenſion of the* Britiſh *Churches, from the* Picts *and* Scots, 178, 179, 182, 186. *The havock made in them*, 202, 203. *Their ſaid State in King* Arthur's *time*, 214, 215. *The firſt exerciſe of Religion then in* Wales, 215, 216, 217, 218. *The enmity of the* Saxons *to the* Britiſh *Churches and their Religion*, 221. *The Liberty and Independency of theſe Churches*, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225

Broſſier (Martha) *her pretended Poſſeſſion with an Evil Spirit*, V. p p p. 248

Brown (*the Father of the* Browniſts,) *ſubmitted at length to the Archbiſhop, and ſubſcribed, but with what ſincerity*, II. 492. *And took the Parſonage of* Achurche *in* Northamptonſhire, ibid.

Bruchion, *what*, III. 131

Bruno, *Founder of the* Carthugian *Order*, V. p p p. 652, 653

C.

T. C's *manner of Writing obſerved*, IV. 1, 2, 3, 4

Cadmus's *Name*, I. 13. *The ſame with* Ogyges, ibid. *Who he was thought to be*, 14. *The Author of Letters amongſt the* Grecians, ibid.

Cajetan *againſt modern Miracles*, V. p p p. 227

Cair Caratauc, III. 903

Cair Celemon, *or* Celemion, III. 909

Cair Ceri, III. 909, 910

Caerleon, III. 912. *The Archbiſhops See removed from hence to St.* Davids, *and by the way to* Landaff, 126, 224

Cair Draitun, III. 913

Cair Ebranc, III. 419

Caermarthen, *anciently* Cair Merdin, III. 913

Cair Maunguid, Mancheſter, III. 910

Cair Meiguod, *or* Meiguaid, III. 912, 913

Cair Penſavelcoit, III. 908, 909

Cair Peris, Porcheſter, III. 908

Cair Ceinte, *i. e.* Canterbury, III. 904. *Was unqueſtionably a City in the time of the* Romans, ibid. *By whom built*, 904, 905. *How made the Metropolitical See*, 924. *The firſt Archbiſhops there*, 925. *See* Canterbury.

Calf (*Golden*) *an Idol*, V. p p p. 534, 535

Calves *of* Jeroboam, *at* Dan, *and* Bethel. V. p p p. 539, 540, 541

Calvin's *Judgment of the* Engliſh *Liturgy and Ceremonies*, II. 475, 476, 477, 550. *And of the Power of Excommunication*, 597

Camalodunum, *what place*, III. 906

Cambridge, *called Cair* Granth, *or* Grant, III. 906

Candles. *See* Holy.

Canon *of Scripture*. *See* Scripture.

Canon-Law. *See* Law.

Canonici, III. 927, 928. *Regulares*, 928

Canonization. *Miracles required for the Perſon to be Canonized*, V. p p. 262

Canons. *See* Councils.

Canons *Eccleſiaſtical, by what Authority obligatory*, III. 699, 703, 704, 705. *How far they oblige*, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712. *Canons of* 1640. 707. *What Cuſtoms vacate Canons regularly made*, 709, 710

Canterbury, *whether a Church of* Benedictins, V. p p p. 680

Capitol, *by whom erected*, V. p p p. 12. *To whom dedicated*, p p p. 13

Caradoc's *Miracles*, V. p p. 210

Des Cartes. *See* Cauſes. *Aimed at Certainty by Ideas*, III. 580, 581. *His Idea of Space*, 583, 584. *His Proof from an Idea conſidered*, II. 83, 84, 85, 86, 93

*Caſes of Conſcience to be reſolved*, III. 669, 670

Caſſander, IV. 584

Caſſiterides, III. 919

Caſtinus *ſent into* Spain, III. 185

Catechizing, III. 627, 628, 629, 668. Roman *Catechiſm explains the Senſe of the Council of* Trent, VI. 425. *Of what Authority it is*, ibid. Catechiſm. *See* Raccovian.

*St.* Catharine's *Revelations in oppoſition to St.* Brigit, V. 94, 95. *She could not only ſee Souls, but ſmell them too*, 95

Catharinus, *against the neceſſity of the Prieſt's Intention to the being of a Sacrament*, IV. 541
Cathedrals *and their Juriſdictions*, III. 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774. *The Uſefulneſs of them to the Biſhop*, 929, 930. *For the Publick Worſhip of God*, 930, 931, 932, 933. *And in order to the Propagation of Religion*, 933, 934, 935, 936
Catholick *Doctrines*, *what*, IV. 355, 356, 357, 358, 359
Catholick *Church*. *See* Church.
Cauſes *Final*, *to be duly attended to*, II. 81, 82, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98. *Mechanical*, *or Matter and Motion*, 99, 100. *Could not of themſelves produce the World*, 101, 102. Des Cartes's *Principles concerning them*, 101. *Their Tendency to Atheiſm*, 102, *&c.* *The Inſufficiency of his Catholick Laws of Motion*, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113. *And that they do not give a ſatisfactory Account of the making of the Univerſe*, 113, 114, 115, 116
Celtæ *worſhipped a great Oak for* Jupiter, V. ppp. 413
Cenſures *Eccleſiaſtical*, II. 421, *&c.*
Centuriatores Magdeburgenſes, *concerning the Divine Right of Epiſcopacy*, II. 405
Cerdic *lands with* Saxon *Forces near* Yarmouth, III. 207. *And beats the* Britains, 207, 208, 209
Ceremonies, II. 623. *See alſo* Bowing *and* Croſs, Crocius *and* Davenant. *Of 3 ſorts*, 553. *The Ceremonial part of the* Jewiſh *Law not unalterable*, I. 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133. *The Ground of theſe Ceremonies*, 137, 138, 139, 140. *Many Ceremonies amongſt the* Lutherans, 552. *Thoſe retained in our Church*, 477. *And why*, 478. *No juſt Cauſe of Separation*, 551, 552, 553, 554
Ceremonies, *of what Eſteem in the Church of* Rome, II. 626, 627. VI. 583. *How made parts of Divine Worſhip*, 627, 628
Cerinthus's *Heretical Doctrines*, VI. 624, 625
Certainty. *See* Ideas. *The Principle of it*, II. 460. *Founded in the neceſſary Exiſtence of a Being abſolutely perfect*, I. 145. *Whatever God reveals is certain*, ibid. *And therefore to be believed as ſuch*, 146, 147. *The moſt certain things not without their Difficulties*, II. 120. *The Grounds of Certainty according to* Des Cartes, III. 543, 544. *Certainty by Senſe*, *or Phyſical Certainty*, III. 565. VI. 87. *By Reaſon*, III. 565. VI. 87. *By Remembrance*, III. 565. *By Faith*, 568, 569. VI. 87, 88. *Of Knowledge*, III, 568, 569. *Intrinſick Grounds of Certainty*, *how far neceſſary*, VI. 369, 370, 371. *Some things certain without Revelation*, III. 570. *Some antecedent Principles to be ſuppoſed*, *before we can believe any thing on the account of Divine Revelation*, ibid. *What kind of Certainty we have of the Principles of Religion*, VI. 88, 89. *Moral Certainty enquired into*, 86, 87. IV. 199. *Metaphyſical Certainty*, VI. 86. *This the main Foundation of all Religion*, IV. 199, 200. *And yields ſufficient Aſſurance that the Chriſtian Religion is infallibly true*, 200, 201. *Proteſtants certain of their Faith*, VI. 191 — 204. *More certain than the* Romaniſts, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376. *True Certainty attainable without Infallibility*, IV. 172, 173, 179, 180. VI. 385, 386, 433
Cæſar, *how far he conquered* Britain, III. 897, 898, 899, 900
Chaldeans, I. 25. *Their Advantage as to the Knowledge of former times*, *above other Heathen Nations*, 26. *See* Chronology.
*A* Chancellor *of a Dioceſe's Power not determined by any Law*, III. 730. *How long his Patent laſts in force*, ibid.
Charity Roman *Catholick*, *handſomely reprimanded*, V. ppp. 581, 582, 583
*King* Charles I. *aſſiſted the* Danes *againſt the Emperor*, III. 972, 973. *And oppoſed the* French *for the Preſervation of the Reformation*, 973, 974
Charters *examined*, *namely*, *St.* Auguſtine's, III. 12, 13, 14. *King* Ethelbert's, 12. *Of* Everſham-*Abbey*, 16. *Of* Glaſſenbury *from* Henry II. 18. *King* Ina's, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16. *St.* Patrick's, 9, 10, 11. *When they were firſt counterfeited*, 15
Chaucer *againſt the Friars*, V. ppp. 657, 658, 659, 660
Chemnitius's *Judgment concerning Epiſcopacy*, II. 404, 405
Cherubims *never worſhipped*, V. ppp. 520, 521
Chillingworth *upon the ſame Subject*, II. 404
China, *with the Meaſures of the Miſſionaries there*, VI. 149, 150, 151
Chineſes's *Religion*, V. ppp. 44
Choice *of Paſtors*. *See* Paſtors. *Of Biſhops*. *See* Biſhops.
Chorepiſcopi, II. 386
*The* Choſen *amongſt the* Jews, II. 310. *His Office*, 311
Chriſm. *See* Holy Oil. VI. 476, 477, 490, 494, 496
Chriſt, *the only begotten Son of God*, III. 359. VI. 628. *How the World was prepared for his Appearance*, I. 29, 30. *The Circumſtances of his Incarnation and Paſſion foretold*, 119. *No Contradiction in his Aſſumption of our Nature*, VI. 638. *He conformed to the receiv'd Cuſtoms amongſt the* Jews, II. 314. *Of the Doctrine of his Satisfaction for our Sins*. *See* Satisfaction *and* Unitarians.

rians. *His Prieſtly Office had a primary Reſpect to God, and not to us*, III. 307, 308, 309, 310, 311. *In what Senſe he came to ſave Sinners*, 346, 347. *The Character given of him by the Apoſtles*, 349, 350. *He ſtood in our ſtead, and was made Sin for us*, 359. *The Oppoſers of his Humanity how ſilenced*, VI. 688, 689. *His Divinity*, 690. *Proved from the Worſhip required in Scripture to be paid him*, 619, 620, 621. *And from expreſs Declarations in Scripture*, 618, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627. *How ſaid to be One with the Father*, 623, 624. *Nor doth the Scripture any where contradict this*, 625, 626 *Proofs for it from Cardinal* Bellarmine, 628. *His Command to* Render unto Cæſar the things that are Cæſars, III. 954, 956. *Some thought the Sun to be Chriſt, and worſhipped it as ſuch*, V. p p p. 673. *The main Ground the Primitive Chriſtians had as to the Truth and Certainty of his Doctrine*, I. 178——195

Chriſtian *Liberty*. *See* Liberty.

Chriſtianity, *when planted in* England, V. p p p. 670. *See* Britain. *Was in King* Ethelbert's *Court* 30 *Years before* Auguſtin *the Monk*, 673

Chriſtians, *for ſome time reckoned as one Body with the* Jews, II. 315. *Their wicked Lives a ſore Prejudice to Religion*, III. 618, 619. *The ancient Chriſtians were declared Enemies to Image-Worſhip*, V. p p p. 444, 445, 446, 447. *And refuſed to worſhip the Images of the Emperors, though only acknowledg'd to be God's Creatures*, p p p. 454, 458. *How deſirous they were to clear themſelves of the Calumnies raiſed againſt them*, VI. 502

Chriſtmas, *why called* Yeul, III. 213

Chronology *of the Heathens uncertain*, I. 45, 46, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60. *Of the* Egyptians, 47, 48, 51, 52, 53. *Of the* Chaldeans, 49, 50

*A* Church, *what*, II. 251, 252, 253. *How far built upon a Divine Right*, 199. *How far upon the Law of Nature*, 200, *&c. How far upon God's Poſitive Laws*, 249, *&c. How ſubject to the Civil Magiſtrate*, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185

Church's *Conſtitution and Government*. *See* Apoſtles *and* Dioceſan Epiſcopacy. *Different from that of the Common-wealth*, 180, 181, 275, 276, 604, 605. *And can ſubſiſt diſtinct from the other*, 423, 424. *Has a diſtinct Charter*, 424, 425, 426. *Diſtinct Officers*, 426, 427. *Diſtinct Rights*, 427. *And different Ends of its Conſtitution*, ibid. *Different Offences alſo may be committed againſt it*, 427, 428. *Its Government abſolutely neceſſary*, 251. *Yet left to particular Churches to determine*, 161. *To be adminiſtred by Officers of Divine Appointment*, 254. *This a Law of perpetual Obligation, as is proved, Firſt, Becauſe the ſame Reaſon for it continues*, 255, 256. *Secondly, From the Divine Declarations concerning it*, 257, 258, 259, 260. *Thirdly, Becauſe the Church it ſelf cannot otherwiſe be preſerved*, 260, 261. *It ſhall always remain in being*, 425, 426. *Whether any particular Form of it were ſettled upon a Divine Right*, 157, *&c.* 251. *Whether any Form once agreed upon be ſo*, 160. *Its Form under the Law*, 261, 262, 263. *How far Chriſtians are bound to obſerve that*, 263, 264. *Whether any particular Form of Church-Government was neceſſarily to be ordained by Chriſt*, 253, 254, 265. *No Neceſſity of inferring it from the* Jewiſh *State*, 253, 254, 265, 266, 267, 268. *Nor from the General Rules laid down in the New Teſtament*, 373. *Nor from the Conſideration of our Saviour as a Legiſlator*, 273, 274, 275. *Nor from the Similitudes the Church is ſet out by in Scripture*, 275. *Nor from the Difference betwixt Civil and Eccleſiaſtical Governments*, 275, 276. *Nor from the Perfection of Scripture*, 279, 280. *Nor from the Calling of the Apoſtles*, 282. *Arguments to prove that Chriſt did not inſtitute any one Form of Government in his Church*, 269, 270, 271, 272. *The Superiority of ſome Church-Officers over others, not contrary to the Rule of the Goſpel*, 272. *To have Power over more than one Congregation, not repugnant to the Conſtitution of Churches in the Apoſtolical times*, ibid. *What Officers in the Church may be ſaid to be new*, 277. *The Churches Polity in the Ages after the Apoſtles*, 372, *&c. All make uſe of thoſe things in Church-Government, which have no other Foundation but humane Prudence*, 417. *The Church's Government on Earth not Monarchical*, IV. 443——453

Church-*Power, what*, II. 420. *Not merely arbitrary*, 421, 422, 424, 425, 426, 427. *As appears from its implying a Right in ſome of inflicting Cenſures*, 428. *And becauſe every Society that ſubſiſts by vertue of a Divine Conſtitution, muſt by vertue of that Conſtitution have all Power neceſſary for its Preſervation in Peace, Purity, and Unity*, 428. *And from the ſpecial Appointment of particular Officers by Chriſt*, 429, 430. *And again becauſe the Church may exerciſe its Power on ſuch as have not actually confederated with her*, 430. *And from our Saviour's Gift of the Keys*, 431, 432. *Nor is Submiſſion due to theſe Officers only by Compact*, 432. *For every one that enters this Society is bound to conſent before he does it*, ibid. *Nor can any Society ſubſiſt without ſuch Submiſſion*,

# of the Principal Matters.


*miſſion*, ibid. *The Extent of this Power*, 433. *The Subject of it*, 421. *Not neceſſarily to be upheld by the Civil Power*, 422, 423

Church's *Rights in a Chriſtian State*, VI. 655

Church-*Cenſures*. *See* Cenſures.

Church, *in a growing State during the Times of the New Teſtament*, II. 268. *Every Miniſter of the Goſpel has a Power reſpecting the Church in common*, 278, 279. *The Church's Rights and Liberties ſecured in the firſt place in the Laws of King* Edward, III. 746. *And in the Great Charter*, ibid. *In the Enquiry after an Infallible Church, ſome particular Church muſt be meant*, IV. 4, 5. *And the* Romaniſts *always attribute this Prerogative to their own Church*, 6. *The Church in Communion with* Rome, *neither Catholick nor Infallible*, ibid. *The right way of judging what Church I am to be of*, 7

Churches, *how firſt ſettled*, II. 385, 386, 387. *Their Increaſe*, 387, 388. *Their Government different in different places*, 389, 390. *Some of them ſaid to be governed only by Presbyters*, ibid. *And others of them to have been upon ſome occaſions a conſiderable time without Biſhops*, 390. *They are ſaid to have been conformable to the Civil Government*, 391, 392. *Had Endowments before* Conſtantine's *time*, III. 110. *Though augmented by him*, 111, 112. *What Churches planted by the Apoſtles, and with what Succeſs*, II. 357, 358. *What Form of Government ſettled in them by the Apoſtles*. *See* Apoſtles. *Suburbicary Churches*, IV. 380

Churches *in the Houſes of* Priſcilla, Aquila, *&c.* II. 578, 579. *The Church at* Cenchrea, 576, 577. *Church at* Jeruſalem, 577

Church *National*, *how diſtinguiſhed from a Chriſtian Kingdom*, II. 604, 5. *National Churches not to be ſeparated from*, 607, 608. *The Difference between* The Church *and* A Church; *and between a* True Church *and a* Right Church, IV. 284, 285. *A particular Church may reform it ſelf*, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 362, 363, 364, 372. VI. 711, 724, 725

Church *Catholick*, *what*, IV. 47, 282. *Why ſo called*, 288, 289. *The Catholick Church taken either for a ſound Church, and of a right Faith*, VI. 671. *Or with reſpect to Perſons and Places*, 671, 672. *Of this ſee* Church *of* Rome, *Different Communions may be in the Catholick Church*, 675, 678, 679. *Whether ſhe hath erred in receiving the Books of Scripture*, IV. 184, 319, 320, 321

Church *has no Power to make new Articles of Faith*, IV. 61, 62

He that hears not the Church, *in what Senſe to be* eſteemed as a Heathen and Publican, IV. 67. *Whether any of its Determinations may be diſputed againſt*, 87, 88. Stapleton's *Opinion for them*, 93, 94. Bellarmine's *againſt them*, ibid. *Notes of the Church*, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133. *Scripture conveyed down to us by the Church*, 732, 733. *Eaſtern and Weſtern Churches how firſt divided from each other*, VI. 676

Churches *ſettled for the Worſhip of God*, II. 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207. *The Strictneſs uſed by the Primitive Chriſtians in admitting Members into them*, 239. *The Privilege of ſuch Admiſſion*, 240. *What ſort of Covenant neceſſary in order to it*, 241, 242. *What things are left undetermined by divine poſitive Laws; the Church may practice as it judges moſt agreeable to the Rule of the Word*, 176. *Things determined both by Laws of Nature, and poſitive Laws of God, but not as to the Circumſtances, may have theſe determined by the Church*, 178, 179. *The Church may likewiſe determine other things indifferent in themſelves*, 179, 180, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189. *It has no direct immediate Power over Mens private Opinions*, 221, 222. *Yet every one is bound to ſubmit to its Determinations in things not determined by the Law of God*, 232. *The Lawfulneſs of the Church's Government over many Congregations aſſerted*, 235, 236, 237. *The Primitive Churches were the Chriſtians of particular Cities*, 373, 374. *The pureſt Church to be choſen*, V. 211, 212, 213

Church *of* England *unreaſonably taxed with taking its Offices from* Rome, III. 147. *Is a true Church*, IV. 365, 366. *Was lawfully reformed*, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370. *And regularly*, V. pp. 105, 106. *Yet is maliciouſly reflected upon*, VI. 9, *&c.* *Its Deſtruction endeavoured by both Papiſts and Diſſenters*, 1, 2. *Not the ſame Reaſon to ſeparate from her that ſhe had to caſt off the Corruptions of* Rome, 56, 59, 726. *Cauſeleſly charged with making an unneceſſary breach in the Catholick Church*, 659, 660, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710. *See* Catholick Church, *and that* Different Communions *may be in it*. *See alſo* Reformation. *What Evidence ſhe has offered that ſhe follows the true Senſe of Scripture*, 739. *Her Communion owned to be lawful by Foreigners*, II. 513, 650, &c. *Yet its Terms of Communion accuſed at home as unlawful*, 620, 621. *What Power left in it to the Presbyters*, 589, 590, 591. *What Authority the Biſhop has in it*, 591, 592. *Its Diſcipline deſcribed*, 593, 594, 595, 596. *The Defects of it*, 596, 597, 598, 599. *Its National Conſtitution*, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603. *The*

*National Church of* England *diffusive*, 605. *Mr.* Baxter's *constitutive regnant part of this National Church considered*, 605, 606, 607. *Church of* England *grounds her Faith on Scripture*, IV. 101. *Was founded in Episcopacy*, III. 651, 669
*The* Greek Church *defended*, IV. 7, &c. *The Charge against them*, 34. *Answered*, 34, 35. *The Schism betwixt them and the* Latin *Church begun at* Rome, 40, 41, 42. *A Follower of Tradition*, 481, 482, 483, 484. VI. 190, 201. *But has however fallen into Error*, 184, 411, 412, 413. *Its Doctrines concerning the* 7 *Sacraments of the* Romanists, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492. *No just Cause to charge them with Heresy*, 678
Church *of* Rome, *not the one holy Catholick Church, but only a part of it*, VI. 666. *As appears from the Silence of Scripture concerning it*, 667. *And from the Testimony of the Second Age*, 667, 668. *With other Testimonies of the Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, Eighth, Ninth, Eleventh, and Thirteenth Ages*, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672. *And moreover it is but a corrupt part of it*, 684. *The* Roman *Catholick Church implies Obedience to the Bishop of* Rome, 667. *Whether it be not a Sin to join with that Church*, IV. 607. *No hope of Peace with her*, ibid. *How to know distinctly what are her Doctrines and Practices*, 655. *Its Faith spoken of by St.* Paul, VI. 3. *Yet charged with Idolatry*, 3, 4, 60. *And this agreeably to the Doctrines of the Church of* England, 4, 5, 6, 7, 34, 35, 36, 37. *As appears from its Homilies*, 8, 9. *From the current Doctrine of the Church ever since the Reformation*, 9, 10, 11, 25, 26, 27, 28. *From the Rubrick at the end of the Communion*, 12, 15, 16, 17. *Mr.* Thorndike's *Arguments in the Case*, 29, 30, 31. *Nor does this overthrow the Article of the holy Catholick Church*, 50, 51. *In what Sense the Church of* Rome *is a true Church*, V. p p. 11, 12, 15. *Her Doctrines prejudicial to Piety*, V. 69. *Fanaticism countenanced in that Church*, 92. *And Rebellion*, 133, 134. *Devotions of several Orders in the Church of* Rome. *See* Devotion. *No Contradiction in the Charge of Divisions in that Church*, p p. 25, 26. *Differences amongst them about Matters of Government*, 155, 156, 157, 158. *Differences between the Regulars and Seculars*, 162, 163, 164, 165. *Superstitious Observations in that Church*, 185. *Yet possibility of Salvation in it*, p p. 16. *What a Change made in the Doctrine and Practice of the* Roman *Church as to Images, between the Years* 604 *and* 714, p p p. 462. *Whether allowing and countenancing the Practice of Idolatry, it can be a true Church*, p p p. 448, 549. T. G's *endeavour to prove the Necessity of joining with this Church*, VI. 53, 54, 55. *The Divisions and Schisms in it*, 675, 676. *Its Uncharitableness in damning all that differ from it*, 581, 582, 592. *Its Innovations in matters of Faith*, 582, 583. *Whether those of this Church do not rather believe as they please, than those whom they so severely charge with doing it*, 644, 645, 654. *No Heresy to renounce the Doctrines of this Church*, 650. *Its Members acted more by Fancy than Judgment*, 653, 696, 730, 733. *It allows of a private Spirit whilst it leads to their Communion, but not otherwise*, 659.
Church-yards *for burying, when begun in* England, III. 19
Cicero's *Prayers to* Jove, V. p p p. 548, 549
Cistercians, III. 690. *Three Limitations of their Privileges*, 691, 693
Cities, *how understood by* Cæsar, III. 898. *Stipendiary*, 918
Claude's *Judgment of the Lawfulness of Separation*, II. 551, 552. *See* Letters.
Claudius's *Expedition hither*, III. 900, 901. *A Coin of his relating to* Britain, 903
Clemens Alexandrinus's *Resolution of Faith*, IV. 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268. *Against worshipping any of the Parts of the Universe*, V. p p p. 26, 27. *Or Images*, ibid.
Clergy. *See* Parishes. *To be respected answerably to the Nature of their Employment*, II. 209, 210. *Misrepresented*, 450. *Exempted by* Constantine *from publick Services*, III. 111. *Their living by their Profession no Argument against the Truth and Certainty of Religion*, 617, 618. *Their Duty as such*, 621, &c. 644, 645, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660. *As taught in the Old Testament*, 645, 656. *As in the New Testament*, 646, 647. *As by our Ecclesiastical Laws*, 648, 649, 650. *Their Obligation to reside upon their Cures*, 625. *To be careful as well as diligent in the Divine Offices of the Church*, 629, 630. *To visit the Sick*, 632, 633. *To have an especial Regard to their Conversations*, 635. *For what Faults they may be deprived. See* Deprivation. *If scandalous, who are the chief Cause of their not being prosecuted*, 653. *What Diligence required of them*, 656, 657, 658, 662——673. *An humble, sober, religious Temper of Mind recommended to them*, 658, 659. *And an Abstinence from needless Curiosity*, 659. *And from a Fondness for new Notions*, ibid. *They were formerly maintained by Allowances out of the publick Contributions*, 928. *Contempt of them, whence it proceeds*, 661. *Such Contempt to be born by them with Patience and Resolution*, ibid. *How to be remedied*, 661,

661, 662. *It is not unlawful for them to meddle in Secular Affairs*, 816, 817, 819, 820. *They were in great Offices*, 831, 839, 840
Clerks *of Parishes*. *See* Parishes.
Colchester, *called anciently* Cair Colun, *or* Colon, III. 905
*A* College *is a Temporal Corporation*, III. 811, *Colleges may be visited without liberty of Appeal to any Court*, 877, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885. *By what Power their Visitor acts*, 877, 878, 879
Colluthus, II. 393, 394
Colman's *Miracles*, V. p p. 209
Colonies (Roman,) III. 915, 918, 919
Commandment 2*d*. II. 533, 534, VI. 62, 63, 64, 68, 69. *Why left out by the Papists*, 572, 573. *The Sense of it*, V. p p p. 505, 506, 507, 508, 512, 513, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 543, 544. *Pretended to be only an Explication of the First*, V. p p. 521, 522. *Pope* Gregory II's *Interpretation of it*, p p p. 523
Commenda perpetua, III. 891, 892. *What is really a* Commendam, 890, 891, 892, 893. *A* Commendam retinere, 886, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894
Communion *Ecclesiastical*, IV. 282. *Every Christian obliged to joyn herein with others*, II. 222, 223. *Till such Communion with them becomes Sin*, 223. IV. 282, 283. *When it is so*. *See* Separation.
Communion. *See* Kneeling. *In both kinds*. *See* Cup, *and* V. 202, 203
Communion *Occasional*. *See* Occasional.
Communion *Parochial*, II. 568, 569, 570
Communion, *for Lay-Dissenters on very easie terms*, II. 456. *As Mr.* Baxter *owns*, 457. *Yet at other times they are condemned as unlawful*, 517
Commutation *of Persons*. *See* Crisp, *and* Persons.
Compostella. *St.* James's *Miracles wrought there*, V. p p. 181, 182, 183
Comprehension, II. 533, 534, VI. 2
Confession. *See* Pennances. *Auricular proved by a Vision*, V. 96, 97. *Defined by the Council of* Trent, *to be of Christ's Institution, and of necessity to Salvation*, VI. 496, 544. *Yet had no Universal Tradition for it*, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 544, 545. *Was not owned by Pope* Gregory 1*st*. 713. *Nor can be proved from Scripture*, 544, 586, 661. *How it came into the Church of* Rome, 501 — 510. *No Article of the Church of* England *against it*, 744
Confirmation, III. 629. VI. 490
Confusion *of Languages*, I. 262, 263, 264, 265
Confusius. *See* China.
Congregations, (*particular*) *only accidental in reference to God's Intention of having a Church*, II. 252
Congregational *Churches*. *See* Independency. *Pleaded for by Mr.* A. II. 607
Conquest. *See* Right.
Conscience. *See* Scruples. *The Weakness of this Plea*, II. 179, 546, 547, 639, 640. *A Case of Conscience resolved at* Rome, V. p p p. 45, 46
Consecrated (*Vessels*, &c.) *how to be respected*, V. p p p. 482
Consent, *universal in favour of Religion*, II. 68 — 79
Constans *killed by* Gerontius, III. 183
Constantius *the Great, thought to be born and proclaimed Emperour in* Britain, III. 23, 56, 57
Constantine, *one of mean Extraction, set up here upon* Gratianus's *Death*, III. 183. *Who made his Son* Constans *Cæsar, and sent him into* Spain, ibid. *But neither of them long survived it*, ibid.
Constantinople. *See* Councils. *The publick Library there*, III. 132
Contempt *of the Clergy*. *See* Clergy.
Contradictions *falsly pretended to be found in Scripture*, II. 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140
Contrition, *whether necessarily required by the Church of* Rome, *in order to Absolution*, VI. 482, 483
Controversy. *See* Councils. *What*, IV. 656 *Of a Judge of Controversies*, V. p p. 72, 73
Convents, IV. 349, 350
Convocations, *how to be called*, III. 706. *When they may sit*, 707
Conversion *of the* English *to Christianity, by whom*, V. p p p. 673, 674
Cosmo de Medicis, *collected Instructions from the Rule of St.* Benedict, *for the Government of his People*, V. p p p. 632, 633
Councils. *See* Infallibility. *By whom to be called*, IV. 475. *The Insufficiency of them to end Controversies*, V. 173, 174. *The Obligation of their Canons*, II. 172. IV. 476. VI. 696. *How summoned anciently*, III. 47. *No Council before that of* Trent *ever determined a Point of Faith meerly upon Tradition*, IV. 457, 458. *No Council sitting at* Rome *and* Constantinople *at the same time*, 466, 467
Councils *General*. *See* Pope. *Whether infallible in their Determinations and Decrees*, III. 108, 109. IV. 65, 78, 146. *That they are so, a Matter of Faith with the* Romanists, 487. *Yet they have no certainty of Faith as to this Infallibility*, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 525, 526. *Not from any Promises in Scripture*, 494, 495, 496, 497.

Par-

*Particularly not from St.* Matthew, 18, 20. 497, 498, 499. *Not from* Act. 15. 28, 499, 500. *Not from the Consent of the Church*, 500. *St.* Auguſtin's *Judgment in the Caſe*, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504. *How far General Councils are to be ſubmitted to*, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516. *The Authority of as many General Councils as ever were, not thought obligatory*, VI. 696. *Diſputes amongſt the* Romaniſts *about the Number of General Councils*, ibid. *Who ſhall be judge whether it be a lawful Council, and proceed lawfully*, IV. 516, 517. *Whether the* Romiſh *Doctrine concerning theſe Councils, or ours, tends moſt to Peace*, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522. *Whether is more unreaſonable*, 522, 523, 524. *Whether the Pope's Confirmation of them neceſſary*, 526, 527, 528, 542. *They are great helps to the Faith of Chriſtians*, 92, 554, 555. *Yet the Church not built upon them*, 249, 250. *Whether ever there were a Council truly General*, VI. 695, 696

Council *of* Ariminum, III. 106, 107, 108

Council *of* Arles, III. 47, 48. *It's Canons not ſent to the Biſhop of* Rome *for Confirmation*, 52. *Neither was aſſembled by his Authority*, 52, 53. *What Canons were made there*, 53, 54, 55

Council *of* Conſtance's *Proceedings againſt* John Huſs, *and* Jerom *of* Prague, IV. 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341

Council *of* Conſtantinople, IV. 406, 407, 408, 409, 410

Council *of* Epheſus, IV. 18, 19, 20

Council *of* Florence, IV. 24, 25, 26, 27

Council *of* Nice's 3d *Canon Suppoſititious*, IV. 374. *Of its* 6th *Canon. See* Ruffinus. *Canons made in this Council*, III. 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64. *The true number of its Canons*, 374, 375, 376, 377.

Council *of* Rome, An. 324. IV. 363

Council *of* Sardica, *concerning the Pope's Supremacy*, IV. 403, 404. *Whether an Appendix to the* Nicene *Council*, 404, 405. *Canons made in it*, III. 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90

Council *of* Trent, *not a lawful Council*, IV. 457. *Becauſe it maintained it lawful to conclude any Controverſy, and make it* De fide, *without any written Word for its warrant*, 457, 458, 459. *Becauſe of the Pope's preſiding in it*, 459, 460, 462, 463. *Becauſe of the unfair Proceedings in it*, 461, 476, 479. *For want of Safety in the Place*, 469, 470. *And of Freedom in Voting*, 471, 472, 480, 481. *And becauſe the Pope had beforehand declared all the Appellants Hereticks*, 473. *As alſo becauſe of the ſmall Number of Biſhops there*, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477. *The Diſparity betwixt this Council and that of* Nice, 477. *More* Italian *Biſhops there, than of all Chriſtendom beſides*, 478, 489. *Whether the Faith defined by this Council were more univerſally received than that of* Nice, 480. *Has not declared what Worſhip is due to Images*, 585. *Gone off from the Principles of Pope* Gregory I. *As to Scripture and Tradition*, VI. 712. *As to the Canon of Scripture*, ibid. *As to the Merit of good Works*, ibid. *As to Auricular Confeſſion* 713. *As to ſolitary Maſſes*, ibid. *As to Tranſubſtantiation*, ibid. *As to Communion in one kind*, ibid. *And to Purgatory*, ibid. *Maſſes for the Dead*, 714. *Worſhip of Images*, ibid. *Extream Unction*, ibid. *And the Pope's Supremacy*, 716. *Card.* Palavicino's *Hiſtory of this Council*, IV. 461, 462

Courts *Eccleſiaſtical. See* Appeal, Equity, Exchequer, High-Commiſſion, *and* Star-chamber. *When held by the* Saxons, III. 775. *Exceptions againſt the Authority of a Court, allowed by our Law*, 812, 813

Court *of Equity. See* Equity.

Court *of Exchequer. See* Exchequer.

Cranmer's *Opinion concerning the Divine Right of Epiſcopacy*, II. 401, 402

Creation *of the World*, I. 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270. *How the Tradition of this came to be contradicted*, 270, 271. *And upon what weak Grounds*, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277. *The Ends God propounded to himſelf herein*, II. 86, 87

Creatures *not to be Worſhipped*, V. p p p. 553, 554.

Creed Athanaſian. *See* Athanaſius. Apoſtles, III. 500, 501, 502. *Pope* Pius IVth's, VI. 519. Nicene *made the Standard of the Catholick Faith*, 676

Creſſy's *Miſrepreſentations of his Adverſary*, V. p p p. 585, 586

Dr. Criſp's *Notion of Commutation of Perſons betwixt Chriſt and us*, III. 365, 370. *The Controverſy betwixt Mr.* Williams *and him*, 373, &c. *His Notion of Sins conſidered as Debts*, 390——400

Crocius's *Judgment concerning Ceremonies*, II. 553

Croſs. *Mr.* Baxter's *favourable Opinion of ſome Worſhip of it*, II. 629. 630. *In Baptiſm*, 627, 628. *Not a ſign of immediate Dedication to God*, 628, 629. *Not a new Sacrament*, 631, 632. *Nor any juſt Cauſe of Separation*, 632, 633

Cuanna's *Miracles*, V. p p. 213

Culdei, II. 389

Cup in *the Sacrament*, IV. 553——564. VI. 564, 565, 566, 590, 591, 713

Cura animarum, *threefold*, III. 625

Curcellæus's *Doctrine of the Trinity conſidered*, III. 455 —— 462

Gurſus, *the ſame with* Officium Divinum, III. 134, 135, 136
Cuſtoms, *when of force*, III. 709, 710. *Immemorial*, 756, 757
Cuthbert's *Miracles*, V. p p. 225
*St.* Cyprian's *mention of* 1 *St.* John, 5. 7. VI. 405. *Divers Paſſages of his conſidered, in relation to the Catholiciſm of the Church of* Rome, IV. 289, 290, 291, 292, 293. *And to its Infallibility*, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310. *His Root and Matrix of the Church*, IV. 605, 606
*The* Cyprian *Priviledges*, III. 66, 67
Cyreſceat, III. 679
*St.* Cyrils *Opinion of the Infallibility of the Church of* Rome, IV. 312, 313. *His Controverſy with* Julian *about Idolatry*, V. p p p. 30, 31

D.

DAillé *of Separation*, II. 551, 552
*Biſhop* Davenant's *Opinion concerning Ceremonies*, II. 554
Davenport's *Expoſition of the Articles of the Church of* England, VI. 719, 720
*St.* David, III. 215, 216. *Said to ſucceed* Dubricius *in the See of* Caerleon, 217. *Taken no notice of by* Gildas, 218. *His Miracles*, V. p p. 205, 206. *The Archiepiſcopal See removed from* Caerleon *to* Landaff, *and thence to St.* Davids, 224
Cair Dauri, *or* Daun, III. 908
Days *for Publick Worſhip of old amongſt the* Romans *of four ſorts*, III. 217. *Lord's Day*, II. 162, 166, 167, 170, 216, 217. III. 662, 663, 664, 665, 666. IV. 161. *Seventh Day*, II. 215, 216. *Holy Days*, 216, 217. III. 666, 667
Deans *and Chapters. See* Cathedrals.
*The Death of Chriſt conſidered as an Expiatory Sacrifice for the Sins of Mankind. See* Sufferings.
Debts. *See* Sin. *The difference between Debts and Puniſhments*, III. 246, 247. *The different Reaſon of them*, 247, 248. *The different end of them*, 250, 251, 252
Decretal. *See* Epiſtles.
*St.* Decumanus's *Miracles*, V. p p. 213
Deiſts. *See* Scriptures. *The right manner of proceeding with them*, II. 119. *Advice to them*, 120. *Their Creed*, 121. *Their Arguments againſt the Authority of Scripture*, ibid. *The Weakneſs of them ſhewn*, 122, &c. *The ways they take to encreaſe their Number*, III. 427, 428. *Their unjuſt Complaints*, 617
De L'Angle. *See* Letters.
Democritus's *Opinion concerning God*, II. 38, 39
Depoſitions. *See* Biſhops, Æthelwolfus, Agilmarus, Beornredus, Sigebert, Stigand, Tunbert, Wilfrid, Winfrid.
Depoſing *Power of the Pope*, IV. 439. VI. 519, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 593, 594, 686, 687
Deprivation *of a Clergyman may be; For Exceſſive Drinking*, III. 638, 639. *For Incontinency*, 639. *For Simony*, 639, 640. *For Dilapidations*, 640. *For Pluralities.* 640, 641, 642, 643. *What Method required in order to a Deprivation*, 727, 728, 811. *Deprivation declared a Temporal thing*, ibid.
Deſiderius's *pretended Miracles*, V. p p. 230, 231
Deucalion, I. 365
Devotion *of the ſeveral Orders in the Church of* Rome *Fanatical*, V. 125, 126, 127, 128. *And groſs Enthuſiaiſm*, 129, 130, 131
Diana's *Temple, whether where St.* Paul's *Church now ſtands*, III. 921, 922, 923
Diligence *required of the Clergy*, III. 656, 657, 658
Dioceſes. *See* Epiſcopacy. *How anciently underſtood*, IV. 379
Dionyſius Areopagita, IV. 620. *A Counterfeit*, V. p p p. 616. *The firſt Myſtick Divine*, 625
Dionyſius *of* Alexandria's *Conference with* Æmilianus, V. p p p. 24
Diſciples, *the LXX and their Meſſage*, IV. 246
Diſcipline. *See* Church, Cenſures, Excommunication. *How to be executed*, II. 597, 598. *Of our Church. See* Church *of* England. *Where beſt exerciſed*, III. 652, 653, 654, 655. *Parochial and Independent*, 655, 656
Diſpenſing *Power of the Pope*, V. 204. *Claimed by him here*, III. 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788. *Great Complaints made of it*, 785, 788. *How far he can diſpenſe with himſelf*, 786, 787
Diſpenſations, *with reſpect to the ancient Canons of the Church*, III. 787. *What the* Canoniſts *afterwards underſtood by a Diſpenſation*, ibid. *Exerciſed in matters of Diſcipline*, ibid.
*A* Diſpenſing *Power in the King alters the frame of our Government*, III. 789, 790, 791. Suarez, *and* Vaſquez's *Opinion concerning it*, 788, 789. *It takes away all Security by Law*, 791. *It contradicts the Senſe of our Nation in former Ages*, 792, 793, 794, 795. *It is contrary to the Precedents in Law*, 795, 796, 797, 798. *Plea for a* Non-obſtante *anſwered*, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802
Diſſenters, *Agents for the Papiſts*, II, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448. *Not like to be won over by Condeſcentions*, 465. *Propoſals for Condeſcentions in their behalf*, 465,

465, 466. *Gone off from the peaceable Principles of their Predeceſſors*, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509. *Their Principles of two ſorts*, 512. *Their ſeveral Pretences conſidered*, 513, &c. *Such as the largeneſs of divers Pariſhes*, 513, 514, 515. *Their Separation only Partial, not Total*, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521. *Separation upon their Principles endleſs*, 521. *In what Caſes allowed of by the Independents*, 522. *Mr.* Baxter's *Opinion of the Miniſtry of the Church of* England, 523, 524. *Their Exceptions againſt our Miniſters open a Door for Separation from almoſt all of them*, 524. *They inſinuate that the whole Body of the Conforming Clergy is guilty of ſuch faults, as that the People may lawfully ſeparate from them*, 528, &c. *Such as Conforming to the Laws and Rites of our Church*, 528, 529. *Uſurpation*, 530, 531, 532. *Perſecution*, 532. *Schiſm*, 533, 534. *Others of them aſſert all Acts of Communion with our Churches to be unlawful*, 534, 535. *The State of the Controverſy with them*, 535, 536, 537. *No parity of Reaſon for the Diſſenters ſeparating from us, and our ſeparating from the Church of* Rome, 647, 648, 649. *How to be treated*, III. 630, 631, 632

Divine *Right*. *See* Right.

Diviſions *juſtly charged upon the Church of* Rome, V. ppp. 25, 26

*A* Doctrine *may be true, though the Truth of it be not ſelf-evident*, I. 144

Doctrine *of Depoſing*, &c. *See* Depoſing *Power*.

Doctrines *Catholick*. *See* Catholick.

Dogmaticalneſs, *in things not clear and evident, juſtly cenſured*, II. 155

*St.* Dominick's *Blaſphemies*, &c. V. 104, 105. *His Miracles*, pp. 189. 190

Donatives, III. 732, 895

*St.* Dorothea, *and* Fanchea's *Miracles*, V. ppp. 211, 212

*The* Doxology, III. 138, 141

Cair Draiton, III. 913

Dubricius, *Archbiſhop at* Landaff, III. 126. *Great reſort to him*, 127. *Afterwards ſaid to be removed to* Caerleon, 217

Dukes, *not known till the* 11th *of* Edward *the Third*, III. 840

*St.* Dunſtan's *Miracles*, V. pp. 210, 226

E.

*AN* Eagle, *ſaid to Prophecy*, III. 907

Eaſter, *an occaſion formerly of great Diſputes about the time of keeping it*, V. ppp. 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693

Ebionites, *a diſtinct ſeparate Body from the Chriſtian Church*, III. 436, 437, 438, 439, 440. *Two ſorts of them*, 437. *The* Jewiſh *Chriſtians not all ſuch*, 438

Eccleſiaſtical *Power, claſhing with the Civil*, V. ppp. 710. *Called the Cauſe of God and Religion*, 728. *Eccleſiaſtical Laws*. *See* Laws. *Eccleſiaſtical Supremacy*. *See* Supremacy. *Eccleſiaſtical Courts*, III. 654, 655, 703, 743, 744. *The Legality of them vindicated*, 746, 747, 748

Education, *a great ground of Prejudice*, I. 196, 197

Egbert's *Miracles*, V. pp. 206

Egyptians, *ſaid to be the firſt who made Images of their Gods*, V. ppp. 510. *Other Conjectures about this*, ibid. *Their Learning in general*, I. 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80. *Their Theology*, 20, 21. *Their Chronology*, 21, 47, 48, 51, 52, 53

Elders. *See* Presbyters. *Lay-Elders*, II. 366, 367

Election. *See* Choice. *Elective Government*, III. 944

Elevation. *See* Hoſt.

Eligius's *remarkable Canon againſt Idolatry*, V. ppp. 415

*Q.* Elizabeth *aſſiſted the* Dutch *againſt the King of* Spain, III. 972. *Her Proceedings vindicated*, IV. 353

Ely *made a Biſhop's See*, III. 777

*The* Ends *God propounded to Himſelf in Creating the World*, II. 86, 87. *Theſe not unbecoming Philoſophical Speculations*, 88

England *an Empire*, III. 742. *Whether an Hereditary Kingdom*, 944, 945, 950. *A true Original Monarchy*, 946. *Its Church*. *See* Church *of* England.

Epicurus, I. 230. *His Diety*, 297, 298, 299. *His fear to deny the Being of a God*, II. 42, 43. *Himſelf and his Followers rather Atheiſts, than Idolaters*, V. ppp. 425

Epiſcopacy. *See* Apoſtles, Biſhops, Church, Churches. *Not thought neceſſary in ſeveral Churches of the Reformation*, II. 396. *Particularly not in our own*, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404. *Not by thoſe in* Germany, 404, 405, 406, 407. *Not by thoſe in* France, 407, 408, 409. *And others*, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416. *Yet great Reverence to it profeſſed by* Luther, Calvin, Melanchton, *&c.* 413, 414, 415. *Dioceſan Epiſcopacy no new Species of Churches, nor repugnant to any Inſtitution of Chriſt*, 588, 589. *Not an unlawful and inſupportable Uſurpation*, II. 579, &c. *Our Dioceſan Epiſcopacy the ſame for Subſtance which was in the Primitive Church*, 580. *This exemplified in the* African *Churches*, ibid. *Who held it for an inviolable Rule, that there was to be but one Biſhop in a City*, 580, 581. *And whoſe Cities and Dioceſes, under the Care of one Biſhop, had ſeveral diſtant Congregations and Altars*, 582, 583. *As they had alſo Metropolitan Provinces*, 583, 584.

584. *The Case not unlike with the Church of* Alexandria, 584, 585. *St.* Jerome's *Testimony as to the Necessity and Usefulness of Episcopacy*, III. 621, 622. *He also declares the Bishops Successors to the Apostles*, ibid. *And very justly*, 622. *The Duty incumbent on them as such*, 622, 623. *The Church of this Nation founded in Episcopacy*, 651, 899

Epistles (*Decretal*) *of* Sixtus Ist. IV. 448, 500. *Synodical*, 449

Epistle *to the* Hebrews, *the best Expositor of the Nature and Tendency of Expiatory Sacrifices amongst the* Jews, III. 296

Equitius's *Miracles*, V p p. 226

Equity-*Courts*, III. 752, 753, 754

Equivocation, VI. 573

Erardus's *Miracles*, V p p. 226

Erasmus *a principal Cause of the Reformation*, VI. 38, 39. *Saith plainly Miracles are now ceased*, V. p p. 234

Error *oftentimes bears a near Resemblance of Truth*, I. 5. *And is taken for it*, 8. *Causes of Error*, II. 303, 304

Essence *how to be understood*, III. 510. *How far it may be known*, ibid. *Hath a reality in it*, ibid. *Real and Nominal*, 552, 553, 554

*The Three* Estates in Parliament, III. 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876

Eternity, *not to be comprehended*, III. 515, 516, 519

Evangelists, II. 368. Timothy *and* Titus *said to be such*, ibid.

Eucharist. *See* Cup, Kneeling. *To be duly frequented*, III. 633, 634, 635. *Anciently administred to Children*, IV. 240, 241. *The real Presence of Christ's Body in it*, VI. 19, 20, 21, 22, 23

Evidence, *the best that a Case will bear, is a sufficient Ground of assent to it*, IV. 173

Evil, *from what Original*, I. 300. *God no Author of it*, 300, 301. *What account the Scripture gives of it*, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307. *This account compar'd with that of the Heathen Philosophers*, 307, *&c. Their two opposite Principles of Good and Evil*, 309, 310, 311. *Taken up from them by* Manes *and his Followers*, 311. *But against all Reason*, 311, 312. *And therefore not held by all the Philosophers*, 312, 313. *The* Stoicks *imputed the Cause of Evil to the Perversity of Matter*, 313, 314. *But without Reason*, 314, 315. *And therefore the modern Philosophers side in this with the Scripture*, 315, 316, 317, 318. *Confessing the Degeneracy of the Souls of Men*, 318, 319, 320. *And that Man's Fall is the Cause of his Apostacy*, 320, 321. *Pleading also a necessity of the Soul's Recovery from this Condition*, 321

Eusebians, *Abetters of the* Arian *Heresy*, III, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 102. 103, 104. *And great Enemies to* Athanasius, 97, 98, 101, 103

Eutychians, *complained of being misrepresented by the Orthodox*, VI. 517

*The* Asiatick Eutychians, *so called, whether really Followers of* Eutyches, VI. 677, 678

Examples, *though in Scripture, do not always bind us to follow them*, II. 169, 170

Exchequer-*Court*, III. 572

Excommunication, ipso facto, II. 637. *No just Cause of Separation*, 638. *By whom to be inflicted*, 597, 598. *The greatest Penalty the Church can inflict upon Offenders*, 244. *The Church's Right to inflict it*, 244, 245, 433, 435, 436, 437. *How practiced amongst the* Jews, 245, 246, 247, 248. *The use of it amongst the Primitive Christians*, 246. *The Power of it remains in the Church after it is incorporated into the State*, 437, 438. *Whether it always implied an authoritative Act of cutting off from the Communion of the whole Church*, IV. 422, 423

Exedra, *what*, III. 131

Exempt *Jurisdictions*, III. 732

Exeter *College's Case upon a Visitation*, III. 877, *&c.*

Exhall *in* Warwickshire, *made a Parish*, III. 616

Expiatory *Sacrifices. See* Sacrifices. *What Expiation designed by them*, III. 296, 297, 298

F.

*Fables of the Heathens oftentimes only Corruptions of the Scripture-History*, I. 9. *Those of the Poets rejected at* Rome, V. p p p. 14

Faith *certain*, I. 145, 146. VI. 376, 377. *What Faith is*, III. 533. VI. 60, 61, 62, 63, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 618. *What things are Articles of Faith. See* Fundamentals *and* Salvation. *Nothing to be received as an Article of Faith, but what has been owned as such by the Catholick Church of all Ages*, IV. 55, 56. *And what has been universally believed to be delivered as such by Christ and his Apostles*, 56, 613. *And the Denial of which was not universally opposed and condemned as Heresy*, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61. *Not though the Church of* Rome *define it*, 62, 67, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75. Scotus's *Opinion in this Case*, 71, 72, 73. *There is no reason to look upon that as an Article of Faith, which they who seem'd to assert it most, did build on such Places as themselves acknowledge to be very obscure*, 613, 614, 615. *Nor which they who taught it did not firmly believe*, 614. *When things of this Nature may be said to be sufficiently pro-*

*propoſed*, 63, 64, 65. *The formal Object of Faith*, 138, 139, 140, 141, 154, 155. *Whether every Article of Faith muſt be received only upon a divine Authority*, 153, 154. *Whether all Divine Faith be infallible*, 179, 180. *New Articles of Faith in the Church of* Rome, 641, 642. VI. 582, 583, 592. *Church of* Rome *has no where declared it ſelf to have power of making implicit Articles of Faith to become explicit*, VI. 418, 419, *In the Proteſtant way of reſolving Faith, our Enquiry is not why we aſſent to a thing divinely revealed; but why we believe a thing to be a Divine Revelation*, IV. 196. *When we ſpeak of the Reſolution of Faith, by Faith we underſtand a rational diſcurſive Act of the Mind*, 196, 197. Clemens Alexandrinus's *Reſolution of Faith. See* Clemens Alexandrinus. Hen. Gandavenſis's *Reſolution of Faith. See* Gandavenſis. *The Grounds of believing what is contained in Scripture to be true*, 197. *The grounds of believing it to be divine*, 198. VI. 406. *The laſt Reſolution of Faith is not into the Infallibility of the Inſtrument of Conveyance, but of the Doctrine thereby conveyed to us*, IV. 201. *Nor into a private Spirit*, 213, 214. *See* Spirit. *Antiquity in this point plainly on our ſide*, 253 —— 270. *And Reaſon*, 271, 272. *All the Articles of Faith contained in Scripture*, 194, 195, 196

*Implicit* Faith, IV. 177, 178. VI. 725, 732

*How far every one is to determine in Matters of* Faith, VI. 646, 725

*The Uncertainty of Faith in the Church of* Rome, V. 207. *Differences of the* Romaniſts *in matters of Faith*, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181. *The Faith of Proteſtants reduced to Principles*, 214, 215. *Moral Certainty is a ſufficient Foundation for Faith*, pp. 35, 36. *The Reſolution of Divine Faith muſt agree to all*, 127, 128. *The Principles about the Certainty of Divine Faith conſidered*, 133, 134, 135, 136. *The Notion of Divine Faith*, 141, 142, *&c. Of the Grounds of Faith*, 149, 150. *Of the Scripture-Notion of the Obſcurity of Faith*, 153, 154, 155. *The Power of the Will in the Aſſent of Faith*, 156, 157

Faith, *Whether to be kept with Hereticks*, IV. 333, 334, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343

Faithful, *in what State before the Reſurrection*, IV. 618, 619

*A great* Famine, III. 187

Fanaticiſm, *what*, V. 92. *Countenanced in the Church of* Rome, ibid, 99, 100. *Fanaticiſm of the* Romiſh *Orders in their Worſhip. See* Devotion. *And in reſiſting Authority under pretence of Religion*, 129, 130, 131. *The Charge of Fanaticiſm upon the* Romaniſts *defended*, pp. 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24

Fanchea. *See* Dorothea.

Faſtidius, *a* Britiſh *Biſhop*, III. 121. *His Doctrine charged as inclinable to* Pelagianiſm, 122. *His Book* de vita Chriſtiana *unjuſtly cavelled at*, ibid.

Faſting, *as practiced in the Church of* Rome, VI. 574, 575

Fauſtus *the Biſhop, originally a* Britain, III. 122. *In what Senſe* Sirmondus *takes him to be ſo*, 123. *A Man of great Eſteem in his time for Eloquence, Learning, and Piety*, 124. *Falſely accuſed of Forgery*, 125. *His Doctrine condemned in the Second Council of* Orange, ibid.

Fechinus's *Miracles*, V. pp. 206

Fergus, *King of* Scotland, III. 182

Ferus, *no Friend to Miracles*, V. pp. 260

Feſtivals, *appointed on the Credit of Revelations*, V. 97, 98

Filioq; *in the Creed*, IV. 35, 36. *When and by whom this Addition was made*, 36, 37. *Whether done by ſufficient Authority*, 39, 40, 41. Leo III. *was for laying it aſide*, 28. *Yet the* Latin *Church anathematiz'd the Deniers of this Proceſſion*, 42, 43

Final *Cauſes. See* Cauſes.

*St.* Fintan's *Miracles*, V. pp. 209

Feaſt *of Firſt Fruits*, II. 203, 204

Firſt-Fruits *Eccleſiaſtical*, III. 759, 760

Fiſher (*Biſhop of* Rocheſter) *no Friend to* Romiſh *Miracles*, V. pp. 233, 234. *Why condemn'd*, III. 811

Flamines, III. 49, 50, 51, 52

Flood, *how atteſted as to the Certainty of it*, I. 345, 346. *The Hiſtory of it*, 336. *Not neceſſary from Scripture to aſſert it univerſal*, 337, 338, 339. *Or if it were, there might however be Water enough to riſe as high as the Scripture ſuppoſes*, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344. *Named from* Deucalion *amongſt the* Theſſalians, 365. *From* Ogyges *by the* Athenians, ibid. *From* Xiſuthrus *by the* Aſſyrians, 366

*Biſhop* Forbis's *Miſtake noted*, V. ppp. 393

Fordon *and his* Scotichronicon, III. 155, *&c.* 181, 182. *A Follower of* Geofrey, 212

Francford. *Troubles there*, II. 474, 475, 476. *The ill Effects of them here*, 479. *Council there condemned the IId of* Nice, V. 33.

*St.* Francis, V. 103, 104, 109. *His Miracles*, pp. 192, 193, 194, p p p. 653, 654. *His Order called in queſtion*, p p p. 664, 665

Fratricelli, *who, and how otherwiſe called*, V. 115, 116

Frauds, *and Impoſtures, and Forgeries of Miracles in the* Roman *Church*, V. pp. 238

French

French *assisted the Confederate Princes of* Germany *against the Emperor*, III. 974. *And the* Catalans *against the King of* Spain, ibid.
Friars, *allowed to preach*, III. 624. *Whether in a State of greater Perfection than the rest of the World*, VI. 576, 577. *See* Mendicants.
Fulco, *an Impostor*, V. p p. 239, 240, 241
Fulgentio's *safe Conduct*, IV. 334
Fundamentals, *Points necessary to Salvation*, IV. 46. *Have not their formal Reason from the Definition of the present Church*, 43, 44. *Whether all Points defined by the Church be Fundamentals*, 46, 47, 48, 66, 77, 78. *See* Scotus *and St.* Augustine. *What things necessary to the Salvation of particular Persons*, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52. *What things necessary to be owned in order to Ecclesiastical Communion*, 52, 53, 54, 55, 63. *Fundamentals the Church's Foundation*, 84, 85, 86. *The Unreasonableness of demanding a Catalogue of them*, 95, 96. *The Fundamentals of Christian Communion to be found in the Creed*, 96, 97. *Yet the Belief of Scripture to be the Word of God is a preceding Fundamental*, 97, 98
Future *State in some measure dictated by the Light of Nature*, II. 60

G.

GAllican *Liturgy*, III. 134. *Different from the* Roman, 134, 135. *Wherein the Difference lay*, 135 —— 147
Hen. Gandavensis's *Resolution of Faith*, IV. 270, 271, 272
Garba, III. 691
Gates *of Hell, how promised not to prevail against the Church*, VI. 52, 53
Gavelkind, III. 754
Gelasius's *Decree about* Apocryphal *Books*, III. 125
Genebrard's *Doctrine concerning the Trinity*, III. 425
Generation *of Mankind*, II. 23, 24, 25, 27 — 35. *Of other Animals*, 26, 27, 28. *Of equivocal General*, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23
Gentleman (*Anonymous*) *his Answer to the* Guildhall-*Sermon*, II. 458
George *of* Cappadocia, *an unjust Invader of the See of* Alexandria, III. 962. *His Case considered*, 962, 963, 964
*St.* Gerald's *pretended Miracles*, V. p p. 211
Germanus (*Patriarch*) *a zealous Patron of Image-Worship*, V. p p p. 466. *Thought it unlawful to make an Image of God before the Incarnation of Christ*, 469
Germanus *and* Lupus, *by whom sent hither*, III. 117, 118, 119, 120, 121. *Erected Schools of Learning amongst the* Britains, 126. *They brought* Ordinem Cursus Gallorum *into the* British *Churches*, 134. *St.* Patrick *one of St.* Germanus's *Scholars*, 128. *The time of St.* Germanus's *coming hither*, 129, 130. *He endeavoured to advance Learning and Piety where-ever he came*, 130
Germany *had but one* Greek *Testament to be found in it before the Reformation*, VI. 39
Germans, *Worshippers of what*, V. p p p. 414
Gerson (John) *against lying Miracles*, V. p p. 227
Gildas *lived, when*, III. 129, 130. *A Passage in him concerning the Conversion of the* Britains, *explained*, 3, 4. *Restored Learning in* Ireland, *and built many Churches and Monasteries there*, 129. *The dismal Character he gives of the Manners of the* Britains, 189. *His Epistle*, 220. *The Five Kings reproved by him*, 220, 221. *His calling the* British *Churches* Sedem Petri, 226. *A Converter of the* English Saxons, V. p p p. 671, 672
Glaber's *History of* Roman *Forgeries*, V. p p. 238
Glasses *painted, the first Testimony of Images in Christian Churches*, V. p p p. 457, 458
Glassenbury. *See* Joseph of Arimathea, Monastry, Monks. *The Monastry there founded by King* Ina, III. 17
Gnosticks, *whence they took the Rise of their* Æones, and Συζυγίαι, I. 19, 20
God, *how said to repent*, I. 121, 122. *An* Idea *of him most agreeable to the Faculties of our Souls, and the Light of Nature*, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236. *How far a Proof of his Existence*, II. 83, 84, 85, 86. *His Promises how to be understood*, I. 123. *He may be clearly perceived, though not comprehended*, 147. *Why* Moses *insisted not on the Proof of his Existence*, 229, 230, 231. *They who deny his Existence assert other things on far less Evidence of Reason*, 236, 237, 238. *And deny some things apparently true*, 239, 240, 241. *We have as certain Evidence that there is a God, as can be, considering his Nature*, 241, 242. *He has stamped a Character of himself upon our Mind*, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249. *Which necessarily implies his Existence*, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253. *His Existence owned by the common Consent of Mankind*, II. 60. *Though some Instances of the contrary are pleaded by Mr.* Lock, III. 545. *His Existence further proved from the Works of Nature*, I. 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259. *And from such Beings as could not possibly proceed from Matter and Motion*, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264. III. 547. *From Miracles*,

*racles, especially those recorded in Scripture,* I. 264. *And from our own Knowledge of things,* III. 546. *So that the Belief of it does not proceed from Ignorance,* II. 41, 42. *He alone is to be worshipped with Religious Worship,* V. 68. *Not to be worshipped by Images,* p p p. 404, 405. *Is an Eternal Mind,* p p p. 425, 426. *His Ends in creating the World,* II. 86, 87. *Of his Divine Justice. See* Justice. *He cannot do any thing that is Evil, or argues an Imperfection,* III. 236, 237. *His absolute Sovereignty not the chief Cause of his Punishments,* 248, 249, 250

*A* God *by Office, a new incomprehensible Mystery,* III. 357

*D.* Godden's *manner of dealing with his Adversaries,* VI. 34, 77, 92, 149. *His unfair Proceeding after the Conference at the Deanry,* 183, 184, 185

God-fathers *and* God-mothers, II. 642, 643, 644, 645

*Publick* Good, *the Rule and Measure of Allegiance,* III. 939, 940. *The Laws the Standard of this publick Good,* 941. *Oaths not to be taken against it,* 941, 942, 943, 946, 947, 948, 949

*St.* Goodrick's *Miracles,* V. p p. 210

Gospel's *Success in the World a powerful Proof of its being from God,* I. 195, 196, 197. *What Prejudices it had to conflict with,* 197 —— 208. *How it over-powered them all,* 208, 209. *Designed to promote the greatest Purity both of Heart and Life,* 223

Gospel *according to the* Hebrews, III. 439

*St.* Matthew's *Gospel, in what Language written,* III. 439

Goths. *See* Laws.

Gratianus Municeps *killed in* Britain, III. 182, 183

Greece's *first Plantation,* I. 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355. *And Language,* 355, 356, 357. *What the* Greeks *worshipped most anciently,* V. p p p. 410

Greek *Church. See* Church.

Gregory de Valentia *denies not that Divine Honour is given to the Eucharist,* &c. V. 49

*St.* Gregory *blamed for his Credulity in the point of Miracles,* V. p p. 225, 226

Gregory II. *for Image-Worship, against his Predecessor's Opinion,* V. p p p. 462, 463. *Cries up those for Martyrs who suffered for the Worship of them,* p p p. 465, 466

Gregory VIIth *the first Contriver of the Clergy's Oath to the Pope,* V. p p p. 708. *His Encroachments upon Kings,* 712

Grimesdike, III. 185

Grotius *disowns the Charge of* Socinianism, III. 271

Ground *See* Holy.

Gualbertus, *a Monk in* Florence, V. p p p. 651

Cair Guaricon, III. 910

*St.* Guibert's *pleasant Stories of the Relicks of Saints,* V. p p. 229, 230, 231

Guide. *See* Church of Rome, Infallibility, Judge in Controversies, Rule of Faith, *No Guide of Christ's Appointment, who teaches any other Doctrine than he taught,* VI. 703, 704, 705. *Authority of the Guides of the Church, what,* V. p p p. 54 —— 65

Guide in Controversies, *his Principles,* V. p p. 123. *Consider'd,* 124, 125. *The Absurdity of them,* 131, 132

Guilt, *considered as to the Nature of it,* III. 363, 388, 389. *The Translation of it,* ibid.

H.

HAdrian's *Wall, where, See* Wall.

*Mr.* Hales's *Opinion concerning the Divine Right of Episcopacy,* II. 403, 404

*Lord Chief Justice* Hales's *Three Constituents of the Laws of* England, III. 740. *His Laws written and unwritten,* 757, 759

Hanno *the* Carthaginians *Prayer to* Jove, V. p p p. 17

Happiness *of Man owned to lie in a Resemblance of God,* II. 60

חרם, *how to be understood when applied to a Sacrifice,* III. 330, 331, 332, 340

Heathens, *whence so called,* III. 898. *Why accused of Atheism,* I. 7. *Whereas they asserted one Supreme God,* V. p p p. 9 —— 45. *Their Mythology,* I. 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373. *Had their publick Societies for Worship,* II. 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207. *And their Festival Solemnities,* 205. *The Supreme God they worshipped, not the Devil,* V. p p p 405, 406. *Three Sorts of Image-Worship amongst them,* 409, 410. *They anointed Stones for their Worship,* 413, 415, 416. *The Wiser of them did not look upon their Images as Gods, but as Symbols and Representations of a Superiour Being,* 437, 438, 439, 440. *And therefore disowned the worshipping of Stocks and Stones,* VI. 517

Hebrews. *See* Epistle. *That Epistle for a long time not received at* Rome, VI. 192

Hector Boëthius's *Authority enquired into,* III. 162, 163, 164

Helvetian *Churches condemn Separation,* II. 553

Hengist *and* Horsa, III. 193. Hengist's *Death,* 204

Henry IV. *an Usurper,* III. 841, 842

Henry VIIIth's *Breach with the Pope,* VI. 745, 746, 747, 748, 749

Heresy, II. 220, 221. *What,* VI. 650. *What anciently understood by it here,* III. 782. *Against the Humanity of Christ,* III. 435

435, 436. *Againſt his Divinity*, 436. *Hereſy, as ſtated amongſt the* Romaniſts, *requires three things to make up the Charge of it*, VI. 718. *The nature of its Propoſition*, 718, 719, 720. *The Authority of the Proponent*, 720, 721. *And the Obſtinacy of the Party*, 721, 722, 723. *But very falſly as applied by them*, 723, 724. *It caſt out of the Catholick Church*, 675

Hereticks, *when to be Rebaptized. See* Rebaptization.

Hermes Triſmagiſtus, I. 21, 22, 76, II. 3

Herodotus, I. 43, 44

Heylyn (Peter) *Characterized*, VI. 32. *Concerning the Sacrifice of the Maſs*, VI. 179

Hierome. *See* Jerome.

High-Prieſts. *See* Jews.

Hiſtory *of ancient Times very obſcure*, I. 9. *And very uncertain*, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65. *Whence ſo rarely to be met with*, 11, 12. *The Deſign of ſome of theſe Hiſtories*, 29. *The beſt uſe to be made of Hiſtory*, ibid. *No certain Credibility in thoſe Hiſtorys which ſeem to contradict the Scriptures*, 10. *What Nations have pretended to moſt Antiquity of Hiſtory*, 16. *Hiſtorys of* Greece, 35 —— 45. III. 165. *And of* Rome, III. 165. *Scripture Hiſtory credible and certain*, I. 66, &c.

Hobbs's *Notions about God conſidered*, II. 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68

*Dr.* Holden, IV. 61

Holy *Candles*, VI. 579, 580

Holy-Days. *See* Days.

Holy Ghoſt, *might be Equal, Conſubſtantial, and Equal with the Son, though not proceeding from him*, IV. 32, 33. *His Aſſiſtance of the Faithful*, V. p p. 129, 130. *Doubtful whether divers of the Fathers did believe the Holy Ghoſt's Proceſſion from the Son*, IV. 10, &c. *They did not account it neceſſary to be believed*, 10, 11, 12, 29, 30, 31, 32. *They made the Belief of that ſufficient to Salvation, which does not imply the Proceſſion from the Son*, 12, 13, 14, 15. *They do not aſſert the Eternal Proceſſion of the Spirit from the Son, but the Conſubſtantiality of the Spirit with the Son*, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20. *Divers Popes alſo of the ſame Perſuaſion*, 20, 21, 22. *And ſome Councils*, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27. *Nor is Theological Reaſon againſt them herein*, 2[illegible]. *Nor the* Athanaſian *Creed*, 68, 69, 70

Holy *Ground, how to be Reverenced*, V. p p p. 570, 571

Holy *Oil*, VI. 579, 580

Holy *Places. See* Places.

Holy *Water. See* Water.

Homily's *of the Church of* England, *no favourers of Images*, V. p p p. 526, 527

Honoratus's *Miracle*, V. p p. 226

Hooker *cleared, as to a Paſſage in his Works*, IV. 225, 226

Horſa. *See* Hengiſt.

Hoſpitallers *and their Lands*, III. 693

Hoſt. *See* Idolatry. *The Elevation of it for Adoration but of late date*, III. 146, 147. *The ſinfulneſs of its Adoration*, VI. 76, 153, 154, 155, 171, 535, 536, 585. *Yet required by the Council of* Trent, 535. *Why the* Romaniſts *adore it*, V. 42. *There cannot be the ſame Reaſon for adoring the Hoſt, as for worſhipping Chriſt himſelf*, ibid. *No Man, on the Principles of the* Roman *Church, can be ſecure he does not commit Idolatry in ſuch Adoration*, 44, 46

Hunni, *who*, III. 180

Jo. Huſs *goes to* Conſtance *upon a ſafe conduct, and how uſed there*. IV. 336, 337, 338, 340

*St.* Hya's *Miracle*, V. p p. 213

I.

Jaddus, *the High-Prieſt*, III. 955

Jamblichus's *myſtical Notions*, V. p p p. 621, 622

*K.* James 1ſt. *aſſiſted the King of* Bohemia, III. 972

Janus, *another Name for* Noah, I. 370

Icarians, *what they worſhipped for their Deity*, V. p p p. 409

Ideas, III. 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511. *Simple and Complex*, 549. *Whether ſufficient Proof of a Deity. See* God, *and* 508, 545, 546, 547. *The Doctrine of them conſidered*, 524, 525. *The Defect of this way of Knowledge*, 532. *The ill Uſe made of it*, 530, 531, 532. *Whether Simple* Ideas *are the Foundation of our Knowledge*, 526, 527, 528, 531, 532, 539, 542, 543, 552, 553, 564, 565, 566, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586. *The firſt uſe of the Word*, 529, 530. Ideas *of Subſtances*, 549. *The Doctrine of Certainty by* Ideas *of dangerous Conſequence to Religion*, 543, 568, 570 —— 580. *No Certainty by* Ideas *unleſs they be clear and diſtinct*, 566, 592. *How far a Certainty by* Ideas *differs from a Certainty by Reaſon*, 590 —— 604

Idolatry, *What*, VI. 12, 65, 66, 67, 95, 96, 97, 98, 172, 173, 873, 877, 878. *Not kneeling before, or looking towards any thing when we worſhip*, 13, 14. *The groundleſneſs of its diſtinction into Material and Formal*, 18. *Its firſt Riſe*, I. 6. *No divine Revelation for it*, VI. 18. *Conſiſtent with holding all the Doctrinal Points of Faith*, 60, 61. V. p p p. 546. *A falſe Notion of it entertained in the Church of* Rome, p p p. 547. *How far Dr.* Stillingfleet *makes the Sinfulneſs of it to depend upon a poſitive Law*, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84. *The Idolatry of*

*of the Gentiles, according to* Voſſius, VI. 83, 84. *Whether the Notion of Idolatry be determinable by the Church,* 99, 166, 172. *Not only the Heatheniſh Idolatry forbidden by God, but the giving himſelf ſuch Worſhip as he judges unworthy of him,* V. 35, 36. *The* Iſraelites *did not fall into the Heathen Idolatry, when they worſhipped the Golden Calf,* 36, 37. *No Contradiction in the charging the* Romaniſts *with Idolatry,* p p. 7. *Dr.* Godden's *Notion of Idolatry examined,* p p p. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9. *How the Writers of that Communion endeavour to quit their Church of Idolatry,* p p p. 346, 347. *The Beginning of the Worſhip of Idols,* p p p. 509, 510. *Scriptures uſe the Word Idol, for the Repreſentation of all ſorts of things, which are made the Objects of Worſhip,* p p p. 512. *A Parallel between the* Heatheniſh *and* Romiſh *Idolatry,* VI. 116, 117, 120, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130. *Particularly, in the Worſhip of the Crucifix,* 140, 141. *The Worſhip of the Hoſt,* 153, 154, 155. *The Worſhip of Saints,* 156, 157, 158, 161, 162, 171. *Upon what account the Fathers charged the Heathens with Idolatry,* 138. *As they did in the Worſhip of Images,* 139, 140, 141, 142, 152, 153, 158, 161, V. p p p. 26, 27. *The Worſhip of falſe Gods,* VI. 142, 143, 144 *The Worſhip of Creatures,* 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 150, 151. V. p p p. 26, &c. *The making God the Soul of the World,* VI. 152, 153, 154, 155. *The Intention of not giving External Worſhip to a Creature, as eſteemed worthy of divine Honour, will not excuſe from Idolatry,* 162, 163, 164, 165, 168, 171, 172. *The Chriſtian Church condemns thoſe of Idolatry, who have been guilty only of applying ſome External appropriate Acts of Divine Worſhip, to to others beſides God,* V. p p p. 373, 374 *How applying ſuch Acts of Religious Worſhip to a Creature, make that Worſhip Idolatry,* p p p. 375, 376. *Church of* Rome *makes its Members guilty of Idolatry,* V. 20. *They are in the ſame Caſe with the* Arians, *whom they acknowledge to be Idolaters,* 31, 32. *A miſtake does not excuſe from Idolatry,* 51. *Biſhop* Taylor *cleared,* ibid. *It is Idolatry to Worſhip God by an Image,* p p p. 435, 436. *Whether a true Church allowing and countenancing the Practice of Idolatry, ceaſes hereby to be a true Church,* V. p p p. 548, 549

Idols, *how allowed in* China, V. p p p. 45, 46. *Meats offered to them, whether lawful to be eaten,* II. 167

*St.* Jerome *of Epiſcopacy,* II. 321 — 332. *Concerning the Catholiciſm of the Church of* Rome, IV. 302, 303, 304. *And its Infallibility,* 310, 311

Jerome *of* Prague's *Safe Conduct,* &c. 338

Jeſuits, V. p p p. 664, 665, 666, 667, 668. *Their Order founded in* Fanaticiſm, V. 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124. *They are for reſiſting lawful Authority,* 131, 132, 133, 134. *Their Oppoſition to Biſhops and their Authority,* 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170. *Their Differences in Matters of Doctrine,* 170. 171. *A Cheat of ſome* Engliſh Jeſuits, p p. 245, 6. *Which turned to great advantage to them till diſcovered,* p p. 247, 248. Jeſuits *in* China *of a different Opinion from St.* Paul, p p p. 442, 443, 444

Jeſus's *Name Bowed at,* V. 41. p p p. 572, 573

*Biſhop* Jewel, *perſecuted by the Diſſenters for his Sermon at St.* Paul's *Croſs,* II. 439

Jews *Characters, both Sacred and Prophane,* I. 63. *Their State, whilſt tributary to the Kings of* Perſia, *and* Syria, III. 955. *When they had their Liberty granted them by the Kings of* Syria, ibid. *When reduced to the Form of a* Roman *Province,* 955, 956, 957. *Their High-Prieſts changed every Year by the* Romans, *in our Saviour's time,* 964

Ignatius Loiola, *Atheiſtical and Ignorant,* V. 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 244, 245

Ignorance *in the Vulgar Sort promoted in the Church of* Rome, VI. 580, 581

Illuminati. *See* Alumbrados.

Iltutus, *a Diſciple of St.* Germanus, III. 127. *A great Promoter of Learning among the* Britains, ibid.

Images *not to be Worſhipped,* IV. 581, 582, 583, 584, 585. V. p p p. 553, 554. VI. 161, 170, 584. *Not allowed in Churches,* V. p p p. 447, 448, 449. *Allowed in Churches, but not Worſhipped,* p p p. 455, 456. *By whom ſaid to be firſt ſet up,* 510. *Many extravagant ones,* ibid. *Proper* Latria *given to an Image is truly Idolatry,* 514, 515. Germanus *the Patriarch, a zealous Patron of their Worſhip,* 466. Tho. Aquinas *aſſerts the ſame Worſhip to belong to Chriſt and his Image,* 569. *What a Change made in the Doctrine and Practice of the* Roman *Church as to Images, between the Years* 604, *and* 714. 494, 495, 496. *Worſhip of* Latria *given to the Image of Chriſt, and why,* 483, 484, 494, 495, 496. *Images of God, according to* Cajetan, *of* 2 *ſorts,* 6, 7. *God not to be Worſhipped by Images,* 425, 426. *Pope* Gregory 2d *for Image worſhip, againſt his Predeceſſor's Opinion,* 462, 463. *And he crys up for Martyrs, thoſe who ſuffered for the Worſhip of Images,* 465, 466. *Homilies of the Church of* England *againſt this ſort of Worſhip,* 526, 527. *What the Church of* England *means by Adoration of Images,* VI.

VI. 36, 37. *What Adoration the* Lollards *were required to give them*, 37. *Worſhip of Images diſallowed of by the Primitive Chriſtians*, 68, 141, 142, 715. V. 29. &c. ppp. 26, 35, &c. 441, 442. *See* Chriſtians, *and* Nice. *Condemned by the Council of* Frankfort, V. 33. *And of* Paris, 34. *Yet both decreed, and uſed by the Church of* Rome. VI. 71, 73, 90, 92, 93, 108, 109, 114, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525. *However proved to be Idolatry*, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 110, 522. *What courſe the Council of* Trent *has taken to rectify matters of this nature*, 522. *A great difference between the regard due to Holy Places and Utenſils, and the Worſhip of Images*, 94, 95. *Second Council of* Nice *denies* Latria *to Images*, 108, 109. *Though it be relative*, 522. *Council of* Trent *avoided declaring what Worſhip they thought due to them*, IV. 585. *Inferiour Worſhip given them, neither anſwers the Reaſons given by the Councils, nor the Practice of the* Roman *Church*, VI. 112, 113. *Our Charge againſt the* Romaniſts *as to the Worſhip of Images groſly miſrepreſented*, 521. *Such Worſhip clearly forbidden in Scripture*, ibid. *Particularly is plainly againſt the Second Commandment*, V. 21, 22. *What Notion the wiſer Heathens had of Images*, 25, 29. *The Worſhipping of God by Images, proved by St.* Paul *to be unreaſonable*, 28. *The Command againſt Image-Worſhip was no Ceremonial Law, reſpecting meerly the* Jews; *but the reaſon of it extends to all Ages and Nations, eſpecially to us, who live under the Goſpel*, 35. *The firſt occaſion given for knowing the meaning of the Law concerning Images, what*, 36. *Images of God unſuitable to his Nature*, ppp. 421, 422, 423. *Worſhip of him by Images repugnant to his Will*, 424. *The difference of the Images of* Heathens *and* Romaniſts, *what*, 437. *How, and when the Worſhip of them began in the Chriſtian Church*, 459, 460. *Image-worſhip objected by* Jews *and* Gentiles *againſt the Chriſtians, as ſoon as it prevailed*, 461. *The Defenders of this Worſhip make uſe of Treaſon and Rebellion to maintain it*, ibid. *Fabulous Storys of Images, for recommending them to the Peoples Devotion*, 465. *And lying Miracles*, ibid. *Many Martyrs for Image-worſhip*, 466. *Antiquity, Fathers, and Councils pretended for it*, ibid. *When Images of God and the Trinity brought into the* Roman *Church*, 468. *And Vindicated*, ibid. *Arguments for Image-worſhip*, 478, 479. *The Ridiculouſneſs of ſuch Worſhip*, 479, 480, 481. Plato *a great Worſhipper of Images*, 433, 434. *The Worſhip of Images in* Rome, *Heathen, and Chriſtian, compared together*, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504. *Four ſorts of Images of the Trinity*, 471, 472. *Such Images condemned by Pope* John *2d.* ibid.

Immaterial *Beings no Contradiction*, II. 64, 65

Immortality. *See* Soul.

Impanation, *what*, VI. 22

Impoſition *of Hands*, II. 323, 324, 325

Incenſe, *one ſort of Religious Worſhip*, VI. 534. *A token of Divine Worſhip*, V. ppp. 361, 362. *Not to be burnt now under the Goſpel*, VI. 160, 161

Incomprehenſible, *what is ſo as to the manner, may be a neceſſary Article of Faith, as far as it is plainly revealed*, III. 357, 358

Indifferent *things*, II. 185, 186. *Occaſion of great Contentions*, 178, 179. *May be ordered and determined by the Church*, 179, 180, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189

Independency *founded upon Reaſons that affect all other Churches, as well as ours*, II. 568, 569, 570. *Not inſtituted by Chriſt*, 588. *Nor taught by his Apoſtles*, 570, 571, 572. *Not in the Church of* Carthage, 572, 573, 574, 575. *Nor Exemplified in Scripture*, 575, 576, 577. *Nor doth the Nature of the Thing, nor the Duty of Man require it*, 577, 578. *See* Dioceſan Epiſcopacy. *Its firſt Riſe*, 493, 494. *The unreaſonableneſs of its Principles*, 495. *The Independents Ordination*, 495, 496. *Their Progreſs*, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503. *The Preſbyterians Charge againſt them*, ibid.

Index Expurgatorius, VI. 512, 580

Indulgences, V. 185, 197, 198. *The Practice of them*, 186, 187. *When begun*, ibid. *Upon what occaſion*, 188. *Indulgences for ſaying Prayers*, 190, 191. *What Opinion has been had of Indulgences in the* Roman *Church*, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196. *The Abſurdity hereof*, 198, 199, 200, 201. *The hindrance they are to Devotion*, 202. *How taught by the Council of* Trent, VI. 435, 436. *What meant by them in the Church of* Rome, 545, 546. *An Impoſition upon thoſe that purchaſe them*, 586, 587

Infallibility. *See* Church *of* Rome, Councils, Judge of Controverſies, Scriptures. *The* Romaniſts *great Boaſts of it*, IV. 484, 485. *The vanity of ſuch Pretences*, VI. 685, 686, 687, 733, 734. *As appears, from the Doctrine of the Prieſt's Intention being Eſſential to a Sacrament*, IV. 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537. *From the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation*, 543 —— 553. *From the Doctrine of denying the Cup to the Laity*, 553 —— 564. *From the Invocation of Saints*, 564 —— 581. *From the Worſhip of Images*, 581, 582, 583, 584. *Infallibility never promiſed to the Church*, VI. 736. *Nor doth the Want of it overthrow all Church-*

*Authority*, V. p p. 97, 98, 99, 100. VI. 726, 727. *Attributed by far more of the Papists to the present Church, than to Oral Tradition*, IV. 627, 628, 629, 645. *The Infallibility of the Pope and Councils disowned by Mr.* White, 640, 641, 642, 643. *The Notion of Infallibility*, V. p p. 30, 31. *No necessity for it under Natural Religion*, 32. *The utmost assurance a Man can have of the Church's Infallibility is only moral*, 34. N. O's *Proofs of Infallibility examined*, 42, 43. *The Arguments from Scripture for it*, 44. *The Arguments from Tradition*, 47, 48. *Those from Reason*, 52, 53. *St.* Augustin's *Testimony concerning it*, IV. 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195. VI. 692, 693. V. p p. 32, 33, 34, 94, 95, 96. *Not the same Motives of Credibility for the Church's Infallibility, which there were for the Infallibility of* Moses *and the Prophets, Christ and his Apostles*, 123. *Miracles, though granted, would not prove the Church of* Rome *Infallible*, 250, 251. *It is as impossible for a Church that has Erred to be Infallible, as for an Infallible Church to Err*, VI. 644, 731. *Our Lord has never promised to keep Men more from Errour, than from Sin*, 685, 736. *Supposing the Church of* Rome *Infallible, and proved to be so by Motives of Credibility, this does not save from the Circle objected to the* Romanists, IV. 122, 123, 124. VI. 618. *How proved by Motives of Credibility, which belong to the Church*, IV. 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 181, 182, 183, 184. *And what those Motives are*, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133. *Whether proved otherwise*, 147, 148, 149, 150. *What Claim the Church of* Rome *can have to it*, 156, 157, 158. VI. 651, 730. *An odd way of arguing for it*, IV. 249, 250. VI. 727. *Whether* T. C's. *Method would ever convince a Heathen of it*, IV. 174, 175, 176, 177, 228. *The Intricacy of it*, 216, 217. *The great Mischief of vain Pretences to Infallibility*, 179, 180, 181, 183, 184, 285. *It serves rather to keep Men in Errour, than preserve them from it*, VI. 727. *St.* Cyril's *Opinion concerning it*, IV. 312. Ruffinus's, 312, 313. *Of St.* Hilary, VI. 693. *Of St.* Athanasius, ibid. *and* IV. 234, 235. *Of St.* Basil, VI. 693. *Of* Epiphanius, *and St.* Chrysostom, ibid. T. C's. *Substance and Degrees of Infallibility*, IV. 193. *Infallibility supposes the Being of a God*, 200. *As likewise a Promise of such Infallibility extant in Scripture*, 227, 228, 229, 230. *Whether the High-Priest and his Clergy were Infallible under the Law*, 231, 232. *If they had been, this would not have proved the Church of* Rome *to be so*, 233. *The pretended Necessity of such an Infallibility*, 233, 234. VI. 391. *Infallibility did not prevent Divisions in the Apostles Days*, IV. 233. *Nowhere promised in the* New-Testament, 234, 242, 243, 244. VI. 661. *The Promises made to the Apostles, not to be extended to the present Church of all Ages*, IV. 243, 244. VI. 555, 556, 557, 590. *Nor to all the Pastors and Doctors of it*, IV. 244, 245. VI. 555. *What is said of the* Jesuits *in this respect*, IV. 245. *Texts of Scripture cited in behalf of the Infallibility of the Church Representative*, ibid. *But to very little purpose*, 246, 247, 248, 249. Bellarmin's *Authorities in behalf of the Church's Infallibility considered*, 305, &c. VI. 391. *Of the Pope's Personal Infallibility*, 518. *See* Pope.

Infant-*Baptism*. *See* Baptism.

Inhabitants *of* Indostan, V. p p p. 608, 609

Innovations *in Matters of Faith. See* Faith.

Insects, II. 23, 25, 26

Intention *of the Priest made essential to a Sacrament*, IV. 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541

Invocation *of Saints. See* Prayer to Saints. *Condemned*, V. 52, 53. p p p. 363, 364. *Whether consistent with the acknowledgment of our sole Dependance upon God for all our Blessings*, 378

Joachim *the Abbot. See* Abbot.

Johannes de Vincentia, *or* Vincenza, *an Impostour*, V. p p. 241

John *of* Constantinople, *cited for the Church of* Rome's *Catholicism*, IV. 297, 298

John, *(King of* England*) no Rightful King*, III. 953, 954. *Resigned his Crown to the Pope*, V. p p p. 729. *And swore Homage to him*, ibid. *His Charter signed by the Bishops*, 729, 730

Joseph *(the Patriarch,) thought to be the* Egyptian Apis, *and* Serapis, I. 372

Joseph *of* Arimathea, *not the Converter of this Island*, III. 4, &c. *Nor Founder of the Church at* Glastenbury, 18, 19

Josephus Acosta, *no Friend to Miracles*, V. p p. 234

Ireland. *Its Antiquities*, III. 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172 *The true Original of their Annals*, 172, 173. *What account their Antiquarys give of their coming into the Northern parts of* Britain, 174. *How their Antiquities and the* Scottish *agree*, 174, 175

Iren, *what Place so called*, III. 129

Irenæus. *See* Antiquity. *His Resolution of Faith*, IV. 259, 260, 261, 262, 263. *A Passage of his concerning the Pope's* Potentior Principalitas *considered*, 423, 424, 425, 426

Irregularity, *upon divers Occasions*, III. 835, 836. *Whether taken away by the Reformation*, 837
Israel *remained a Church after the Separation between* Judah *and the Twelve Tribes*, IV. 253, 254. *The Idolatries of the* Israelites, V. p p. 536
*St.* Ita's *Miracle*, V. p p. 210
Jubilees, V. 188
Judas, *whether present at our Lord's last Supper*, II. 599
Judge of Controversies, V. pp. 72, 73. *See also* Infallibility, Church of Rome, Scripture. *The Necessity of a living Judge in matters of Faith considered*, IV. 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 455. VI 682, 683, 685, 687——697, 702, 703, 704, 705, 709, 710, 711, 732, 733
Judgments *of Mankind of different Sizes*, II. 156
*What* Judgment *of Discretion allowed to private Persons in matters of Religion*, VI. 200, 201, 373, 374, 388, 390, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396. *See* Reason *and* Spirit.
Julian the Apostate's *Vindication of the Heathen Idolatry*, V. p p p. 418. *His Agreement with the Papists herein*, 418, 419
Juliana, *a great Enthusiast in the* Roman *Church*, V. 98. *Her Revelations*, 99
Jupiter, *whether the Supreme God, or an Arch-Devil*, VI. 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 129——138. *A threefold Sense of him amongst the Fathers*, 126, 127, 128. *The Character given of him by the* Romans *can belong only to the Supreme God*, V. p p p. 15, 16, 17
Juries. *See* Trials.
Jurisdiction, *what*, III. 767. *Here, is twofold Spiritual and Temporal*, 742, 767, 768. *Of Patriarchs and Metropolitans*, 63, *&c. Papal*, 65——90. *Of the Archbishop of* Canterbury, 771
Jus Italicum, III. 916
Justice *Punitive in God, what*, III. 235. *When agreeable to his Wisdom and Holiness, is a proper Divine Attribute*, 236. *No breach in the Measures of it, by our Saviour's offering himself for our Redemption*, ibid. *Universal Justice an essential Attribute of God*, 236, 237. *How far Punitive Justice is founded in it*, 237, 238. *Very agreeable to Divine Justice to accept a Satisfaction on behalf of the Sins of Mankind*, 239
Justin Martyr. *See* Antiquity. *His Resolution of Faith*, IV. 254, 255, 256, 257, 258. *His Sense of Idolatry*, V. p p p. 9, 10, 11

K.

KEiran's *Miracles*, V. p p. 211
Kent, *had* 4 Roman *Forts in it, and where*, III. 904. *The* Saxons *Kingdom began there*, 203. *What Kings reigned there when* Claudius *came from* Rome, 901
Kentigern's *Miracles*, V. p p. 205, 207. *He was the first that preached Christianity to the* Saxons *in* England, p p p. 671
Keys *given to St.* Peter. *See* Peter. *Power of them*, II. 431, 432
*The* King *declared Head of the Church*, III. 761. *Is supreme Patron of all Benefices*, 781, 890. *And presents to them upon Promotion of the Incumbent to a Bishoprick*, 886, 887, 888, 889. *Nor ought be to be debarred of his Priviledge*, 890
King Arthur, *Son of* Uther Pendragon *by* Igerna, III. 207. *The* British *Fables about him*, 208, 209, 210, 211. *His Seal*, 211, 212. *His Inscription on his Coffin*, 212. Leland's *and* Price's *Vindication of him*, ibid. Fordon's *Account of him from* Geoffry, 212, 213. Hector Boëthius's, 213. *His Diploma to* Cambridge, 211, 215. *A Question made whether ever there were such a Person*, 211
King Athelstan, III. 944
King John. *See* John.
King Stephen's *bad Title to the Crown*, V. p p p. 709. *Confirmed by the Pope*, ibid. *He promises Obedience to the Pope*, ibid. *The Clergy swore only a conditional Allegiance to him*, ibid. *Appeals to* Rome *frequent in his time*, 710
King Lucius. *See* Lucius.
King's *Bench, what sort of Court*, III. 884
King's *Supremacy*. *See* Supremacy.
King-killing *Doctrine*, IV. 438, 439
Kircher, I. 32, 33
Kneeling *at the Communion*, II. 646. *What meant by it*, V. 41. *Charged with Idolatry*, VI. 12, 13. *Papists not required to kneel in the Act of Receiving*, 14
Knowledge, *what degree of it Man was at first endued with*, I. 2. *Our first Parents Knowledge of all Creatures*, 3. *The Deficiency of humane Knowledge*, III. 532. *Whether all our Knowledge is from* Ideas, 549, 555, 556
כבוד, *how used in Scripture*, III. 326, 327. *How the* Jews *understand it*, 328, 329, 330, 341

L.

LAcedemonians, *what they worshipped*, V. p p p. 410, 413.
Landaff. *The Bishops there once claimed an Archiepiscopal Power*, III. 217, 224, 225
Languages, *whence the Diversity of them arose*, I. 262, 263, 264, 265
Lapse *of Benefices, in what time*, III. 723, 724. *And to whom*, 726, 727
Last-Days, *why the Gospel-State called so*, II. 257
Latria *due only to God*, V. p p p. 476. *But by Accident it may belong to other things*, ibid.

ibid. *What it is,* VI. 525
*Archbiſhop* Laud *exclaimed againſt,* IV. 44. *Charged with Sophiſtry,* 62, 79. *And with a threefold Falſification of* Vincentius Lerinenſis, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93
Launoy *has a pleaſant Story out of the* Roman *Martyrology,* V. ppp. 231, 232
Law. *See* Moſes.
Laws *Natural and Poſitive, how different,* II. 164. *Promiſory, Penal, and purely Poſitive,* 168. *To make a poſitive Law immutable, it muſt be known to come from God, with an Intention to oblige to the World's End,* 163, 164, 165. *How it may be known when a poſitive Law binds immutably,* 165, 166, 167, 168, 169. *Laws penal againſt* Papiſts, V. ppp. 694. Romaniſts *ought to be ſubject to them,* ibid. *Good Reaſon to require Obedience to them,* 695, 696, 697. *They are charged with Injuſtice and Cruelty,* 698. *This Charge conſidered,* 699 — 737. *The ancient Penal Laws compared with the modern,* 737. *The Occaſion of the preſent Penal Laws great,* 738, 739, 740. *Made againſt Treaſons,* 741, 742, 743, 744. *No reaſon for the Repeal of them,* 746, 747. *Why,* 747, 748, 749, 750. *Humane Laws cannot change the Nature of Good and Evil,* VI. 737, 738. *The Foundations of our Laws,* III. 797, *&c. Laws the Standard of Publick Good,* III. 941
*Canon*-Law, *in divers Caſes not conſiſtent with Sincerity,* III. 835, 836. *Nor with the King's Power over Eccleſiaſtical Perſons,* 836, 837. *The Uſe heretofore made of it,* 831. *Not now minded in ſome Caſes,* 837
*Eccleſiaſtical* Laws, III. 703, 704, 743. *Theſe ſtand on the ſame bottom with the other parts of the Common Law of* England, 754
*Common* Law, III. 743, 746, 747, 752. *Some Fundamental Maxims in it,* 751
Laws *of* Edward *the Confeſſor,* III. 743
Gothick Laws, III. 751
Laws *of Nations,* III. 974, 975
Laws *of Nature, what,* II. 172, 174. *Their indiſpenſable Obligation,* 171, 172, 173, 174. *God may limit the permiſſive Law of Nature,* 176. *And may determine the Circumſtances of what this Law enjoins,* 177
Lawful, *an expreſs Command not neceſſary to make a thing ſo;* II. 158, 159, 160, 174, 176, 185, 186. *Except in things whoſe Goodneſs depends upon a meer poſitive Command,* 158
Learning. *Of the* Egyptians, I. 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80. *Promoted through the* Roman *Empire by* Antoninus Pius, *and others,* III. 133. *The preſent State of it in theſe Parts,* VI. 38
Le Blanc's *Opinion of Separation,* II. 552
Legates a latere, III. 930
Legionary *Aſſiſtance to the* Britains, *what, and when given,* III. 188, 189
Cair Legionum, III. 914
Leiceſter, *called anciently* Cair Lerion, III. 911
Le Moine. *See* Letters.
Lent, *how obſerved in the ancient Church,* II. 195, 196
Leporius Agricola, III. 116
Letardus, *or* Luidhard, *Queen* Bertha's *Biſhop before* Auguſtine *came,* V. ppp. 673. *He made the King inclinable to Chriſtianity,* ibid.
Letters *by whom invented,* I. 13
Letters *from Mr.* Le Moine *in* French, II. 650. *And in* Engliſh, 654. *Mr.* De L'Angle *in* French, 658. *And in* Engliſh, 661. *Mr.* Claude *in* French, 664. *And in* Engliſh, 669
Leviathan *confuted,* II. 425
Liberius, *the Pope, an* Arian, VI. 47. *Subſcribed the Condemnation of* Athanaſius, *and owned the* Sirmian *Creed,* III. 106
Libertinus's *Miracle,* V. pp. 226
Liberty *of the Will. See* Will. *Chriſtian Liberty may be reſtrained by the Magiſtrate,* II. 188, 189, 190, *Some Directions to be obſerved in ſuch Reſtraint,* 194, 195, 196, 197
Libraries. *See* Conſtantinople, Bibliotheca Capitolina, *and the* Muſæum *at* Alexandria
Licences *from the Biſhop,* III. 657
Cair Ligualid, *and* Legeuit, *and* Lualid, III. 914
Lim *in* Kent, *anciently* Portus Lemanis, III. 904
Lincoln *anciently called* Cair Luitcoit, *and by the* Romans Lindum, III. 911
Literæ formatæ, IV. 448
Liturgy. *See* Gallican, *and* Forms of Prayer.
Lobb's *firſt Letter,* III. 369. *Its Anſwer,* 370. *His ſecond Letter,* 371. *The Biſhop's Anſwer,* 372
Lock's *Complaints of the Biſhop's peculiar way of Writing,* III. 521. *His Lordſhip's Anſwer,* 522. *He argues againſt himſelf,* 522, 523. *Ridicules the Notion of Subſtance,* 523. *And condemns the* Logician's *Definition of it,* 524, 525. *His Doctrine of* Ideas *enquired into,* 526, 527, 528, 529. *See alſo* Ideas. *He owns his Belief of the Scriptures, and the Myſteries delivered by them,* 530. *Acknowledges the Defect of our Reaſon,* 532, 533. *Makes the Soul not to be neceſſarily immaterial,* 535, 536, 544. *But confutes himſelf herein,* 539, 540, 541. *Vindicated againſt* Toland, *in reſpect to his Belief of the Scriptures,* 532, 533. *Directed to an eaſy way of clearing himſelf, by owning the Doctrine of the Trinity,* 563

Lollards, *how required to worship Saints and Images*, VI. 37
London, *whence so called*, III. 899. *Founded by the* Romans, 27, 897, 898, 899, 900, &c. *The chief Metropolis among the* Romans, 121, 122. *Called* Augusta, 122. *The first mention we find made of it is in* Tacitus, 896. *Celebrated for its Antiquity by* Ammianus Marcellinus, ibid. *Severely used by the* Britains, ibid. *Whether it were a* Roman *Colony*, 918, 919
Lord's *Day*. *See* Day.
Lord's *Supper*. *See* Eucharist.
Lord's *Prayer, whether to be used to Saints*, V. 39
Loretto, *famous for the miraculous Translation of its Chappel thither*, V. p p. 172, 173, 174. *Miracles wrought there*, 176, 177
Loyalty *taught by the Church of* England, VI. 731, 732
Lucian *of* Antioch, *his* III. 444, 445
Lucidus *recanted his Errors about Predestination*, III. 123
Luciferians. *The Rise of their Schism*, III. 59
*King* Lucius's *Government of all* Britain *disproved*, III. 36, 37, 38. *Yet not unlikely that there was such a King in some part of* Britain, *and where*, 39, 40, 41. *Nor that he might entertain the Christian Religion*, 41, 42. *Yet this will not imply that there was no Christianity here before*, 42, 43, 44. *His pretended endowment of Churches here*, 110
Ludgard's *Miracle*, V. p p. 220
Ludovicus de Barbo, *a Reformer of the* Benedictine *Order*, V. p p p. 652
Ludovicus Vives's *Opinion of Popish Miracles*, V p p. 224
Luidhard. *See* Letardus.
*St.* Lupus. *See St* Germanus. *By whom sent hither*, III. 117, 118, 119, 120, 121
Lutherans *have many Ceremonies*, II. 552, 553. *How represented to the* Greek *Church*, 482
Lyons. *In the Council there the* English *complain of the Pope, and refuse the Tribute granted by King* John, V. p p p. 729, 730
Lyra *complains of the Frauds of the* Romish *Priests*, V. p p. 228

M.

MAgdalena de la Cruz, *a notorious Impostor*, V. p p. 242, 243
Magistrate's *Duty with respect to the Church*, II. 180. *The Extent of his Power in Ecclesiastical Matters*, 182, 183, 184, 185. *And in indifferent things*, 185, 186, 188, 189, 190. *May restrain Christian Liberty*, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193. *Some Directions to be observed in such restraint*, 194, 195, 196, 197. *May enjoin Matters of Order and Decency*, 197. *And such his Injunctions bind the Conscience*, 198. *May also alter them upon a fit Occasion*, 198, 199
Magna Charta, III. 746. *The Intention of it*, 747
Mahomet *and his Followers*, III. 430, 431
Mahometans *charged with Idolatry, and for what*, V. p p p. 409. *See* Mana.
Maldonate, *no great Friend to* Romish *Miracles*, V. p p. 259, 260
Mana, *or* Meneeth, *worshipped by* Mahometans, V. p p p. 410
Manchester *anciently called* Cair Maunguid, III. 910
Manes, *whence he had his Notion of two opposite Principles of Good and Evil*, I. 311. *The Unreasonableness of it*, 311, 312
Manetho, *whence he took his History*, I. 22, 23. *Objections against it*, 23, 24. *Occasion of his writing it*, 32. *The Age he wrote in*, ibid. *His* Egyptian Dynasties, 50
Manse, *what*, III. 674, 675
Marcus *made Emperor in* Britain, *but soon taken off*, III. 182. 183
Markolis, *and his Figure*, V. p p p. 412
Maria Visitationis, *Abbess of the Annunciation in* Lisbon, *outdid St.* Francis, V. 189, 243, 244
Maronites *declared to be good Catholick Christians*, VI. 677
Marquesses *not in being till* Richard IId's *time*, III. 840
Marriage *of Priests, and the ill Consequence of asserting it to be worse than Fornication*, V. 204, 205, 206
Martirius's *Miracle*, V. p p. 226, 227
Mary Magdalen's *Vial, and other Relicks. See* Miracles.
Mary, *the Blessed Virgin*, *See* Virgin.
Masses *made a Trade of*, V. 80. *See* Missa.
Masters *of Families were anciently their Priests*, II. 210, 211
Matrimony. *See* Marriage. *Made a Sacrament by the Council of* Trent, VI. 486. *But they had no Tradition to prove that it confers Grace*, 486, 487, 488. *The* Greeks *deny it to be a Sign of the Conjunction of Christ and his Church*, 492. *Allowed by the* Canonists *to the Excommunicate*, 495
Matter *and* Motion. *See* Causes.
Matter *cannot think*, 508, 539, 540, 541, 542, 547, 548
Maximus Tyrius's *Vindication of the Heathen Idolatry*, V. p p p. 417, 418
Meaux. *See* Bishop.
Mechanical *Causes*. *See* Causes.
Mecredsburn, *and the Battle fought there*, III. 206
Melchior Canus's *Opinion of* Roman *Miracles*, V. p p. 224. *He charges* Bede *and St.* Gregory *with relating Miracles upon Common Reports*, 224, 225
Mellitus *banished, and why*, III. 934

Mendicant *Friars*, *blasphemous Enthusiasts*, V. 105. p p p. 653. *How they broke their Rule of Poverty*, 655. *Yet much encouraged*, 656, 657. *How served by the Pope*, 660, 661. *Their great Wealth*, ibid.. *A Dialogue betwixt a Mendicant and a plain Countryman*, 662, 663
Meneeth. *See* Mana.
Mercury *seems to have been* Canaan, *the Son of* Cham, I. 371
Merit, *what*, VI. 424, 541. *From God not in our Power*, III. 381, 382. *Used by St.* Jerome *for Authority and Principality in the Church*, IV. 450. *Not owned by* Gregory *the Great*, VI. 712. *And is a very unreasonable Doctrine*, 542, 543, 586. *Yet this Doctrine asserted by the Council of* Trent, 466, 467. *But had no Catholick Tradition for it*, 468, 469, 470, 471. *However it is now asserted to the height*, VI. 473, 474. *How it came to be entertained in the* Roman *Church*, 471, 472, 473
Metropoles, III. 121
Metropolitans, II. 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 288, 289, 392, 411, 583, 584. *Their Rights secured by Canon 4th of the Council of* Nice, III. 60. *Their Jurisdictions*, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67. *Were in the Western Church before St.* Augustin's *coming hither*, 211. *Their Power in this Nation*, 698, 699
Mice *said to be generated of the Mudd of* Nile, II. 16. *But falsly*, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22
*Ministers of the Gospel have all of them a Power respecting the Church in common*, II. 278. *And were appointed as soon as our Saviour began to preach the Gospel*, 283, 284. *Yet are said not to succeed by way of Analogy to the Priests under the Law*, 321
Miracles, *said to be done amongst the Heathens*, I. 160, 161. *But far short of those amongst Christians*, 161. *In what Cases they may be expected as Credentials to a Divine Commission*, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 124, 125. *No greater rational Evidence of a Divine Testimony than these*, 160, 161. *Never wrought but for some considerable end*, 162. *Our Religion fully established by them*, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 172. *The pretences to Miracles in the* Roman *Church*, 170. V. p p. 170, 171. VI. 578, 579, 684. *How to be known when true*, I. 210. *True Miracles may be distinguished from false*, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215. *Some Rules for distinguishing them*, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225. *Why they are not still continued.* II. 134. *Required of the Pope and his Followers*, IV. 130, 131. *The greatest Number of them have been credited upon fabulous and uncertain Reports*, V. p p. 170, 171. *Such Authentick Testimonies as these have been amongst the greatest Enemies to Christianity*, 180. *Miracles wrought by St.* James *at* Compostella, 181, 182. *St.* Mary Magdalen's *Vial, and other Reliques*, p p. 185, 186. *Miracles of St. Dominick*, p p. 189, 190, 191. *Of St.* Francis, p p. 192, 193, 194. *Of the* British *and* Irish *Saints*, p p. 195, 196. *Those of their Legendary Saints outdid the Miracles of our Saviour*, p p. 205, 206. *Of St.* Dunstan, p p. 210. *Of St.* Patrick, ibid. *Of St.* Fanchea, p p. 211. *Of St.* Keiran, ibid. &c. *Testimonies of St.* Chrysostome, *and St.* Augustine, *against the continuance of the Power of Miracles*, p p. 217, 218. Melchior Canus's *Opinion of* Romish *Miracles*, p p. 224, 225. *See also to the same purpose*, Josephus Acosta, Ludovicus Vives, Maldonate, Petrus Damiani, Stella, Tostatus, Xacchius. *Miracles no Proof of the true Church*, V. p p. 223. *The Credibility of the* Romish *Miracles destroyed by the Testimony of their own Writers*, p p. 224. *The Miracles wrought by Christ and his Apostle, did sufficiently prove that they were Teachers sent from God*, p p. 251. *Miracles wrought by Hereticks and Schismaticks*, p p. 254. *For* Romish *Miracles, See SS.* Alban, Anthony, Batra, Bartholomew, Beonanus, Benignus, Bernac, Boniface, Brendan, Caradoc, Colman, Cuana, Cuthbert, David, Decumanus, Desiderius, Dorothea, Egbert, Equitius, Erardus, Fechinus, Fintan, Gerald, Gerson, Goodrick, Honoratus, Hya, Ita, Kentigern, Libertinus, Loretto, Ludgard, Martirius, Mochua, Modwenna, Moedoc, Munnu, Neot, Nonnosus, Vincentius Ferrerius, Fr. Xaverius. *See likewise* Frauds.
Missa, *used for the whole Publick Service*, III. 141. *Canon of the Mass*, 145, 146. *Not used anciently by foreign Churches*, 146. *Sacrifice of the Mass*, VI. 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 566, 567. *Hearing Mass, what*, 180. *Solitary Masses*, VI. 713. *Masses for the Dead*, 715
*St.* Mochua, *and St.* Munnu's *Miracles*, V. p p. 206
*St.* Modwenna's *Miracles*, V. p p. 207
*St.* Moedoc's *Miracles*, V. p p. 212
Michael de Molinos's *Doctrine*, VI. 416
Monarchy *the most ancient Government*, III. 946
Monastick *Orders, upon what Founded*, V. 100. *Enthusiasm the occasion of them*, ibid. *Monastick State, whence it came, and when, and how encouraged*, V. p p p. 634. *Brought into Reputation at* Rome, 635. *But lost much*

*much of it's Regard in the* East, *before it began to ſpread in the* Weſt, 635, 636. *Quarrel amongſt themſelves*, 637. *Much complained of by Wiſe-men*, 338, 639
Monaſtry *of* Glaſſenbury *founded by King* Ina, III. 17
Monaſtrys *in* Britain *no elder than St.* Patrick's *time*, III. 115. *Nor long before at* Rome, ibid. *Of different ſorts*, 927. *The firſt occaſion of their Deſtruction*, VI. 750. *The ancient Monaſtrys in the Weſtern Church, intended for Nurſeries to the Church*, III. 128
Monks, *but little acquainted with Poverty*, V. p p p. 649, 650, 651
Montanus, *and his Doctrines*, V. p p p. 602, 603
Months, I. 46
More (*Sir* Thomas) *miſtaken*, V. p p p. 729. *Why condemned*, III. 811
Morley. *See* Biſhop.
Mortuary, III. 678
Moſes's *Education*, I. 74, 75, 80. *Had in great Veneration amongſt the* Egyptians, *and other Neighbouring Nations*, 72. *The undoubted Author of the Books that go under his Name*, 70, 71, 72. *His Hiſtory of undoubted Truth and Certainty*, 73, 74. *Well qualified to underſtand what he wrote*, 80, 81. *And had due Information concerning it*, 81, 82, 83. *His Fidelity as an Hiſtorian*, 83, 84, 85. *And as a Legiſlator*, 85, 86. *His Miracles of what Authority*, 125, 126. *Whether his Law was ever to be laid aſide*, 127 — 142
Municipia, III. 915, 916
*The* Muſæum *at* Alexandria, III. 131, 132
Muſick *in Divine Worſhip*, III. 931, 932, 933
Myſterys, *what*, III. 351, 514. *The Belief of them juſtly required of Chriſtians*, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 450. *The unreaſonable Diſputes that have ariſen about them*, 432. *Whether to be rejected by us, becauſe above our Comprehenſion*, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518. *Owned by Mr.* Lock, 530
Myſticks. *Their way of writing unintelligible*, V. p p p. 589, 590. *It leads Men into ſtrange Illuſions of Fancy*, 592. *Has no Foundation in the Chriſtian Doctrine*, ibid. *Pretended nevertheleſs to be vindicated from Scripture*, 598, 599. *Great Fanaticiſm in it*, 599, 600. *A Diſhonour to the Chriſtian Religion*, 601. *Has been condemned by the Church in former Ages*, 602. *When it came in vogue amongſt Chriſtians*, 616
Mythology *of the Heathens*, I. 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373

N.

NAaman's *Bowing in the Houſe of* Rimmon, VI. 168, 170, 171
Nabonaſſar, I. 28
Names, III. 550. *When their Signification altered, become a common Cauſe of miſtake*, II. 303, 304. *Of Biſhop and Presbyter equivalent*, 335. *And uſed promiſcuouſly for a long time*, 347, 348, 349, 350. *Nature not Names, makes the diſtinction of Things*, III. 550, 551, 562
Nantz. *The Council there againſt Idolatry.* V. p p p. 415
Nathanlead (*or* Nazalead) *one of the greateſt Kings of the* Britains, III. 207. *His great Victory over* Cerdic, ibid. *Was killed in the Battle*, 207, 208. V. p p p. 415
Nature. *See* Laws, Names, Perſon. *Its Priviledges may be parted with*, II. 175. *Teaches that there ought to be Societies for the Publick Worſhip of God*, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207. *That theſe Societies are to be maintained and governed in the moſt convenient manner*, 208. *That there muſt be a Superiority of Power and Order amongſt them*, 208, 209. *That ſuch who are employed in the immediate Service of God, and entruſted with the Power of Government, in the Society appointed for that end, are to have reſpect paid them anſwerable to the Nature of their Employment*, 209, 210, 211, 212. *That all things relating to the Worſhip of God, or the Government of the Society, be performed with the greateſt Solemnity and Decency*, 212, 213, 214. *That Time and Place be duly circumſtantiated for this Worſhip*, 215, 216, 217. *And that People ſhould prepare themſelves beforehand for it*, 217, 218, 219. *As alſo that there ſhould be a way agreed upon, for deciding Controverſies which tend to diſturb the peace of the Society*, 219, 220. *To what way for doing this the Light of Nature directs*, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237. *It dictates, that all who are admitted into this Society, muſt conſent to be governed by the Laws and Rules of it*, 237, 238. *And again, that every Offender againſt its Rules muſt ſubmit to its Cenſures*, 243, 244
Nature *of a Thing, what*, III. 509, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590. *Whether it be a Collection of ſeveral* Ideas, *into one complex abſtract* Idea, 551, 552
Nazarens, *what their Sect*, III. 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 559
*St.* Neot's *Miracles*, V. p p. 208
Nerius (Philip) *Founder of the Society of the Oratorians*, V. p p p. 668, 669
Neſtorius, III. 447. *His Followers complained of being miſrepreſented by the Catholicks*, VI. 516

Neſtorians (*modern* Aſiatick) *whether of his Principles*, 677, 678
Neubrigenſis (Gulielmus) *his Story of* William Long-beard, *a* Roman *Cheat*, V. p p. 238
Nice. *The Doctrines of its Second Council*, V. 30. *Rejected by the Council of* Francfort, 33. *Rejected alſo in* England, *becauſe of its aſſerting the Worſhip of Images*, ibid. *A farther account of it*, p p p. 464. *This Council ordered all Writings againſt Image-worſhip to be ſuppreſſed*, 467. *Allowed any Image of God or the holy Trinity*, &c. ibid. *What worſhip was to be given to Images by this Council*, 474, 475, 481. *Lower than* Latria, 483. *This not a lawful General Council*, 555, 556. *Nor received as ſuch by the Church*, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562
Nicene *Creed*. *See* Creed.
Noah, *the ſame with* Deucalion, I. 365. *With* Ogyges, ibid. *With* Saturn, 366, 369, 370. *With* Prometheus. *See* Prometheus. *With* Janus, ibid. *And with* Bacchus, ibid.
Nonnoſus's *Miracles*, V. p p. 226
Norbertus, *Founder of the Order of the* Præmonſtratenſes, *ſaid to have had a Revelation from the Bleſſed* Virgin, V. 93
Normans, *their manner of Sealing*, III. 13
Northern Saxon *Kingdom*, III. 209
*Duke of* Northumberland's *Caſe*, III. 952, 953
*Kingdom of* Northumbers *originally elective*, III. 944. *And not thought worth accepting*, ibid.
Nothelmus's *Story of St.* Gregory's *coming to convert* England, V. p p p. 674
Novatianiſm, II. 555
Numa, *the Books found in his Tomb*, II. 55. *Why burnt*, 56. *The* Capitol *built by him*, V. p p p. 12. *And dedicated to the True God*, ibid.
Nuns, VI. 576, 577

O.

OAth *of Fealty and Canonical Obedience to the Pope*, V. p p p. 706, 707, 708. *When begun, and by whom*, ibid. *Oaths no juſt Ground for a Separation of Communion*, III. 937, 938. *The Nature and Obligation of Political Oaths*, 938, 939. *The Intent of thoſe who require Oaths of Allegiance*, 939. *Oaths not to be taken to the Prejudice of a third Perſon*, 941, 942, 943. *Yet may ceaſe to oblige without his Diſcharge*, 943, &c.
Obedience *to Princes*, IV. 453, 454, 455
Oblations, III. 676, 677, 678, 679, 680. *Of Bread and Wine at the Altar*, VI. 181. *Theſe anciently called Sacrifices*, 181, 182
Obſtinacy, VI. 721, 722, 723, 724
Occaſional *Communion*, II. 515——521. *Its Unlawfulneſs*, 537, &c. *Bare Occaſional Communion does not excuſe from the Guilt of Separation*, 537, 538, 539. *Where this is lawful, conſtant Communion is a Duty*, 540. *This proved, Firſt, From the general Obligation upon Chriſtians, to uſe all lawful means for preſerving the Peace and Unity of the Church*, 540, 541, 542, 543. *And then from the particular Force of that Text*, Phil. 3. 16. 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548
Ocellus Lucanus's *Opinion of the Origin of the Univerſe*, I. 272, 273, 274. II. 58, 59
Odomantes, I. 358
Offices *Divine*. *See* Clergy.
Ogyges, *the ſame with* Cadmus, I. 13. *And with* Noah. *See* Noah. *Whence ſaid to be preſerved in the univerſal Deluge*, 365
Ogygia, I. 14
Ομοσιος, III. 100, 101
Optatus Milevitanus *appealed to for the Catholiciſm of the Church of* Rome, IV. 299, 301, 302, 303
Oratorians *in the* Roman *Church, who the Founder of this Order*, V. p p p. 668. *When begun*, ibid. *The Conſtitutions of it*, 667
Orchomenij, *what they worſhipped*, V. p p p. 410
Order *of the* Jeſuits, *how it roſe*, V. p p p. 664. *Their Privileges*, 665. 666, 667. *Their Arts and Cunning*, 667, 668. *See* Jeſuits.
Orders (*Religious in the Church of* Rome.) *See* Devotion. *Founded in Enthuſiaſm*, V. 100. *Some account of the Order of* Benedictines, p p p. 673, 674, 675, 676, 677
*Holy* Orders. *See* Re-ordination. *Whom* Conſtantine *forbad to enter into them*; III. 111. *Whether a true and proper Sacrament, as the Church of* Rome *teaches*, VI. 477, 478, 479. *Five different Opinions concerning the Matter of this ſuppoſed Sacrament*, 479. *The Difference betwixt the* Greek *and* Latin *Churches in this reſpect*, 491
Ordination, *firſt amongſt the* Jews, II. 308, 309, 310 *And from thence tranſlated into Chriſtianity*, 310. *Of a Biſhop to be at leaſt by Three*, 333. *If by One only, whether valid*, III. 225. *This Office performed by meer Presbyters*, II. 392, 393, 394, 416. *Ordination of Biſhops not thought neceſſary*, 401, 402. *Of the* Browniſts *invalid*, 491. *The* Engliſh *Ordinal confirmed by Act of Parliament*, III. 805, 806. *The Orders of the* Engliſh *Clergy vindicated*, VI. 40, 41. *Orders imply in them Juriſdiction*, 42, 43, 44. *How truly*, 45, 46, 47. *Orders given by Hereticks valid*, 41, 42, 47, 48. *And by Idolaters*, 44, 45. *Their indelible Character*,

*ster, what,* 43, 44
Origen *explained,* V. p p p. 3. *Asserts against* Celsus, *that Divine Worship is to be given to God only, and to his Son* Jesus Christ, 28, 29
Orleans. *The Imposture of the* Franciscans *there,* V. pp. 242
Osiris *and* Isis *worshipped by the* Egyptians, V. p p p. 533, 537, 538.
*Dr.* Owen's *manner of answering the* Guildhall-*Sermon,* II. 458

P.

PAchomius *is said to have received the Monastick Rules in a Table of Brass from an Angel,* p p p. 631, 632
Pædobaptism. *See* Baptism.
Pagans, *whence so called,* III. 898
Paijon's *Opinion of Separation,* II. 551, 552
Palætyrus, I. 18
Palavacino's *History of the Council of* Trent, IV. 461, 462
Paphians, *what they worshipped,* V. p p p. 410
Papists, *restless Enemies to the Church of* England, II. 440, 442. *Their Contrivances to this purpose,* 443, 444, 445, 446, 449. *Call their particular Church by the Name of the Catholick Church, or at least the Church indefinite,* IV. 43. *Endeavour to shrivel Christianity into a Party or Faction,* 44, 45. *And to make Religion subservient to Temporal Ends,* 45. *Their Argument for the Unity of their Church,* 98, 99. *Whether they do not better deserve the Names of Schismaticks and Hereticks, than those who pass with them under these Characters,* 99. *It is thought a wonder, that all the wicked Men in the World are not* Papists, V. 70
Paradice, *out of which Man was cast,* I. 322. *The Island of* Paradice, V. p p. 216
Paradoxes, *Dr.* Stillingfleet *charged with them,* V. p p p. 550, 551, 552
Pardons. *See* Indulgences.
Parishes, *as settled here,* III. 614, 615, 616, 649, 933, 935. *The Reasonableness of having a fixed Parochial Clergy,* 652, 653, 654, 655, 656
Parish-*Clerks, how introduced,* III. 650
Parisiensis (Joannes) VI. 22
Parliament. *See* Estates.
Parochial *Bounds how settled here,* III. 702. *Their Tythes how settled,* 894
Παροικία, II. 392
Pascentius *raises a Rebellion against* Ambrosius, III. 206
Paschasius Radbertus Ist. *Broacher of Transubstantiation,* VI. 19
Pastors, *whether to be chosen by the People,* II. 608, 609. *The Plea of the People's Original Right to make such Choice,* 609, 610, 611. *The ancient Practice of it,* 611. *The main Foundation of the People's Interest in this respect,* 611, 612, 613, 614. *These Elections caused great Disturbances in the Church,* 614. *To prevent which Canons were made for regulating Elections, and Bishops were chosen without the People,* 615, 616. *Christian Magistrates interposed in these Elections,* 616, 617. *The Prince's Right of Election no where more fully acknowledged than in* England, 617, 618. *Nor is there any Ground for our People to insist upon a Liberty of Election,* 618, 619, 620
Patriarchs, II. 389, 411. *Whether all equal,* IV. 374, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383. *Their Jurisdiction,* III. 63 —— 75. *Of* Constantinople, *set up and deposed at the Pleasure of the Grand Seigneur,* 964
*St.* Patrick's *Miracles,* V. p p. 210, 213. *One of St.* Germanus's *Scholars,* III. 128. *See* Germanus *Set up an University at* Dublin, 128, 129. *Said to consecrate* 350 *Bishops with his own hand,* 216
Patronage, *and the Rights of it,* II. 617, 618, 619, 620. *Its first Rise,* III. 674, 675, 976. *It is but a Trust,* 738, 739
*St.* Paul's *Church, whether built in the Place of* Diana's *Temple,* III. 921, 922, 923. *Founded by King* Ethelbert, 924, 925, 526. *By whom endowed,* 927. *How built, and how destroyed,* 934, 935
*St.* Paul, *whether he first planted Christianity in* Britain, III. 24, 25. *His Travels in the East,* 26
Paulus Samosatenus, III. 441, 442, 443, 444
Peculiars, III. 732
Peers, *their House a supreme Court of Judicature,* III. 804, 805
Pelagians *complained of being misrepresented,* VI. 516. *Condemned in the Council of* Ephesus, IV. 82, 83. *And at* Rome, III. 116. *And Imperial Constitutions published against them,* ibid.
Pelagianism, *brought into* Gaul *and* Britain, III. 116, 117. *How stopt here,* 117, 118. *Charged on* J. Serjeant, VI. 417, 418
Pelagius, III. 112, 113, 114. *Our Monkish Historians make him Abbot of* Bangor, 114, 115. *The Popes* Innocentius, *and* Xystus, *and* Zosimus *too favourable to his Opinion,* 115, 116
Pelagius, *Bishop of* Rome, *how ordained,* II. 392
Pelasgi, I. 352, *&c.*
Pendragon. *See* Uther.
Pennance, *called a Sacrament by the Church of* Rome, V. 69. *And made one in the Council of* Trent, VI. 496. *No real Sacrament,* VI. 479, 480. *Nor is there any universal Tradition for this part of the New* Trent-*Article,* 480, 481, 482, 483. *How esteemed in the* Greek *Church,* 491. *The ancient and modern Pennances very different,* 501, 502, 503,

503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510. *The* Romish *Doctrine of Penance destroys the Necessity of a good Life*, V. 69
Cair Pensavelcoit, III. 908, 909
Persecutions *of different Sorts*, III. 35
Persians, *Their old Religion*, V. p p p. 38
Person, *what*, VI. 630, 638, 639. *Person how distinguished from Nature*, III. 509, 548, 549, 560, 561, 574, 575, 576, 577, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611. *The* Idea *of it*, 611. *What it really is*, ibid.
Personality, *what it imports*, III. 417, 511, 611
Persons, *Commutation of them how to be understood*, III. 362, 363, 364, 382. *How denied by Mr.* Williams, 365. *Dr.* Crisp's *Sense of it enquired into*, 365, 366, 367, 368. *And Mr.* Williams, 409, 410
Pesel, *what*, V. 24. p p p. 507, 508, 525
Pessinuntij, *what they worshipped as their Deity*, V. p p p. 409
Peter-pence, V. p p p. 726, 727
*St.* Peter, *no Monarch of the Church*, II. 288, 289, 290, 291. *When the Circumcision first fell to his share*, 302, 303. *In what Sense he received the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven*, IV. 519, 520
*St.* Peter's Cornhill, III. 935
*St.* Peter's Westminster. *See* Westminster.
Petrus Damianii *against lying Miracles*, V. p p p. 227
Petrus Joannes's *Doctrines*, V. III. *Like our* Quakers, ibid. *An account of his Brethren*, 111, 112. *Against all Swearing*, 112. *Maintain'd the Doctrine of Perfection*, 113. *Committed all kind of Wickedness*, 114
Philoponus, (Joh.) *concerning the Doctrine of the Trinity*, III. 422, 423, 424
Philosophers *supposed two opposite Principles of Good and Evil*, I. 309, 310, 311. *But not all of them*, 312, 313, 314, 315. *Some of them sided with the Scriptures in this matter*, 315, 316, 317, 318. *Confessing the Degeneracy of the Souls of Men*, 318, 319, 320. *And that Man's Fall is the Cause of his Apostacy*, 320, 321. *And he ought therefore to endeavour a Recovery from this Condition*, 321. *They speak also of the Devils envying the Happiness of Men*, 322. *Of his appearing in the Form of a Serpent*, 322, 323, 324. *And of Man's being cast out of Paradise*, 324
Philosophy's *main End*, II. 87, 88
Picts, *who*, III. 149, 150, 153, 154. *Whence they came into* Ireland, *and how*, 171, 172. *The constant Succession of them*, 171
*A great* Plague, III. 187
*Holy* Places. *What Reverence may be paid towards them*, V. 40. *See* Holy Ground.
Plato's *Wit and Learning*, II. 48. *What he delivers about the Being of God*, 49, 50, 51, 52. *And a Providence*, 52, 53, 54, 55. *Thought to have borrowed from* Moses, III. 497. *His Notion of the Divine Essence enlarging it self to three* Hypostases, 498
Plotinus, V. p p p. 620, 621
Pluralists, *how to behave themselves*, III. 657, 658
Pluralities, *Arguments against them*, III. 671, 672. *Canons concerning them*, 672, 673
Poetry, *whence its Original*, I. 35, 36, 37, 38
Polycrates, *Bishop of* Ephesus, *with a Council of Bishops, disowned* Victor's *Authority over them*, VI. 668
Polytheism. *See* Idolatry.
Pope. *See* Church of Rome *and* Dispensing Power. *His pretended Authority has given great Disturbance to the Christian World*, V. 138, 139, 140, 141. *His personal Infallibility*, IV. 323, 324, 431, 528, 529, 530, 531. VI. 558, 709, 710, 711. *Denied, and the Belief of it condemned as Archiheretical by* T. White, *one of their own Communion*, IV. 61, 348, 349. *And by the Author of* Popery misrepresented and represented, VI. 518. *Not Head of the Church*, IV. 330, 377, 378, 383 — 399, 402, 403, 404, 405, 431, 481, 482. VI. 667, 590, 668. *Not sole Judge of what is to be reformed in the Church of Christ*, IV. 360, 361, 362. *His Power limited*, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383. *His Supremacy disowned by the Eastern Patriarchs*, VI. 643, 676, 677, 678. *His Confirmation said to be required to all new elected Patriarchs*, IV. 383, 384. *And that he had a Power of deposing and restoring Patriarchs*, 384, 385. *He has no Supremacy over Patriarchs*, 390, 391, 395. *The Growth of his Greatness*, 400, 401, 402, 405, 419, 420. *Of his Authority in this Nation. See* Appeals *and* Britain. *His Exactions here*, III. 804, 805. *He granted Collations here upon Promotions*, 887, 888. *And* Commendams *and* Dispensations, 888, 889. *His Title of Universal Bishop*, IV. 405, *&c.* VI. 557, 558, 716. *His Plea of being St.* Peter's *Successor*, IV. 430, 431. *His Authority not proved from Scripture*, 433. *Not from St.* Luke 22. 32. 433, 434, 435, 436, 437. *Not from St.* John 21. 15, 16, 17. 437, 438. *Has no Right to preside in General Councils*, 463. *Did not preside in that of* Nice, 463, 464, 465. *Not in that of* Constantinople, 465, 466. *Not in that of* Ephesus, 467, 468, 469. *Nor is it very clear that he did at* Chalcedon, 469. *Or the Second at* Constantinople, ibid. *His pretended Power of deposing Princes*, VI. 519, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564.

*His Diſpenſing Power*, 613, 614. V. 204. *See* Suarez. *Enquired into*, VI. 558, 559, 560. *His Management in the Caſe of* Henry VIIIth's *Divorce*, 748. *Hiſtory of Popiſh Uſurpations*, V. 137, 138. *And encouraging Rebellions*, V. 133, 134, 135, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143. *Popes Quarrels with the Emperours, and other Chriſtian Princes*, 143, 144, 145, 146. *Their Arguments to prove Kings ought to be ſubject to Popes*, ppp. 701, 702, 703, 704, 705. *They forbid Biſhops and Prieſts to pay Homage to Princes*, 706. *Yet require an Oath of Fealty to themſelves*, 706, 707

Popiſh *Biſhops objected againſt being Depoſed by our Reformers*, III. 964, 965

Popiſh *Plot*, II. 449

Porcheſter, *anciently called* Cair Peris, III. 908

Porphyrius *and his Doctrines*, V. ppp. 618, 619

Portſmouth, *whence ſo called*, III. 207

Poſitive *Inſtitutions by no means unalterable*, I. 128, 129, 130. *Nor any Mutability in God's Repealing them*, 137, 138. *How it is to be known, when poſitive Laws bind immutably*, II. 165, 166, 167, 168

Poſſeſſion *made a Plea for the* Romaniſts, IV. 602, 603

Poſſeſſion *of the Crown a juſt ground for an Oath of Fidelity*, III. 977, 978

Poverty *little known amongſt the Monks*, V. ppp. 649, 650, 651

Power *of the Keys*. *See* Keys.

Præadamites, *how abſurd a Fancy*, I. 335, 336

Præbenda, III. 928

Præfecture, III. 915, 916, 918

Præmonſtratenſes, III. 692

Præmunire. *Some account the Statutes about it*, V. ppp, 732. *Theſe firſt made at* Carliſle, 733, 734, 735, 736

Prayer, *what*, V. ppp. 377. *Of what Eſteem in the Church*, II. 363, 364. *A peculiar part of Divine Worſhip*, VI. 106. *How it comes to be ſo*, V. ppp. 377, 378. *Secret*, III. 139. *Bidding*, ibid. *Forms of it not only Lawful, but highly Expedient*, 629, 630. *Due Attendance upon it required*, 667. *To Saints*, IV. 564—581. V. 53. VI. 100, 101, 104, 105, 169, 170, 584, 585. *See* Invocation, *and* Saints. *Made a ſolemn part of Religious Worſhip in the Church of* Rome, VI. 101, 102, 103, 104, 526, 527, 528, 529. *Prayers to the Bleſſed* Virgin, 530, 531, 532, 533. *The common Evaſions of the* Romaniſts *about it anſwered*, V. 61, 62. *Prayers to the Saints, when firſt begun*, VI. 102. *Condemned by the Fathers*, V. 54, 55, 56. *The Difference between Praying to Saints in Heaven, and deſiring Men on Earth to pray for us*, 65. *St.* Auguſtine *no friend to Invocation of Saints*, 58. *Prayer for the Dead*, VI. 661. *How allowed of by the* Greeks, IV. 611. *Not mentioned in the Articles of the Church of* England, VI. 744. *Theſe do not neceſſarily inferr a Purgatory*, IV. 615, 616. VI. 569. *Archbiſhop* Uſher's *Doctrine in this Point vindicated*, IV. 616, 617, 618. *Whether Lord's Prayer may be uſed to Saints*, V. 39. *Prayers to Angels*, 59, 60. *Condemned by the Council of* Laodicea, VI. 104, 105. *Prayers in an Unknown Tongue*, V. 72, 73, 74. VI. 513, 570, 571, 572, 591. *The Language of Prayer no matter of Diſcipline*, V. 75. *No univerſal Conſent for ſuch Prayers*, 76, 77. *Prayers of the Church, in St.* Auguſtin's *time not begun till the* Catechumens were diſmiſſed, ppp. 394. *After their Diſmiſſion, performed at the Altar*, 395

Preaching, II. 363, 364. *Who allowed to undertake it*, III. 624. Extempory-*Preaching cautioned againſt*, 627. *What ſort of Preaching moſt uſeful*, 627, 628, 652. *Diligence and Care required in it*, 667, 668

Predictions *how to be tried*, I. 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117. *Concerning our Saviour's Incarnation and Paſſion*, 119

Prejudice *dangerouſly Powerful*, I. 157. II. 281

Preſence *of Chriſt in the Euchariſt*. *See* Euchariſt.

Presbyters. *See* Names, *and* Ordination. *A Title taken from the* Jews, II. 334. *The Power it imports*, 335. *Colledges of them ſettled where neceſſary*, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368. *What Power allowed them in the Church of* England, 589, 590, 591

Presbyters Conductitij, *what*, III. 651

Preſcription, III. 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698

Prieſts. *See* Marriage, Egyptian, I. 62. Phœnician, ibid.

Prieſt-craft, *a moſt unreaſonable and malicious Charge*, III. 616, 617

Prince *of* Wales's *Birth ſuſpected*, III. 970. *The Evidence for it excepted againſt*, 970, 971

Private *Spirit*. *See* Spirit.

Proclus, *a friend to Myſtick Divinity, though a great Enemy to Chriſtianity*, V. ppp. 622, 623

Procurations, *whence their firſt Original*, III. 638

Procurator Cæſaris, III. 917

Prometheus, *ſeems to have been* Noah, I. 370 *or perhaps* Magog, 371

Prophecy. *See* Predictions. *Made to* Abraham, Gen. 15. 13, 14, 15, 16. *conſidered*, II. 135, 136, 137

Prophets, *after* Moſes, *their Fidelity*. I. 92. *Their Schools*, 94, 95, 96, 97. *How theſe Schools*

*Schools tended to fit Persons for the Prophetical Office*, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101. *They needed not to confirm their Doctrine or Commission by Miracles*, 92, 93, 94, 95, 102. *How their Predictions were to be understood*, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123. *Prophets raised up extraordinarily*, 124. *The Punishment of False Prophets amongst the* Jews, 102. *Which of them to be punished by God only, and which by Men*, 103. *The Difference betwixt a False Prophet and a Seducer*, ibid. *To whom the Tryal of them belonged*, 104, 105. *The Rules of judging them*, 105, &c.

Prosèuche, II. 307

Prosper's 12. Chronicon, III. 120. *Several of this Name*, ibid.

Protestants, *why so called*, IV. 329. *Theirs the safer way to Salvation*, 586——597. *Their Faith enquired into*, 597, 604

Providence, I. 297, 298, 299, 300. II. 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34. *Objected against, because of the Inequality of its Distributions in this Life*, I. 324, 325, 326. *But very undeservedly*, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332. *Visible in the Frame of the World*, II. 89, 90, 91, 92

Provinces. *See* Suburbicarian. *Not assigned to the Apostles at their first being sent to Preach*, III. 301, 302, 303. Roman *Provinces*, III. 916, 917

Punishments. *See* Debts, *and* Rewards. *The Ends of them*, III. 243, 244. *The Reason of Punishments in Justice and Government*, 247. *The Ends of them*, 254, 255. *The Magistrate's End in them distinct from that of Private Persons*, 256. *God's Ends in Punishments here in this Life*, 257, 258, 259. *Those in the other*, 259, 260. *The Measure of them to be taken from the Dignity of the Sufferer*, 275. *A Person may be punished beyond the desert of his own Actions*, 285, 286. *An Innocent Person may consent to suffer for another*, 287, 288, 292, 293, 294, 295. *Instances in Scripture, of Children punished for their Parents Faults*, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292

Purgatory. *See* Tertullian. *What*, IV. 609, 610, 612. *A profitable Doctrine*, 608, 609. *Made by the* Romanists *a necessary Article of Faith*, 609. *Yet owned by several of them not to have been known in the Primitive Church*, 611. *And by others, that it cannot be proved from Scripture*, 611, 612. *And flatly denied by others*, 628. *As also by the* Greeks, 610, 611. *St.* Augustine *far from making it an Article of Faith*, 613, 614. *Whether it can be inferred from the Doctrine, or Use of Prayers for the Dead*, 615, 616, 617, 618. *Unknown to the Fathers, till* Gregory *1st.* 618, 619, 625, 713. *Not taught by* Dionysius Areopagita, 620. *Nor by* Tertullian, 620, 621. *Nor by St.* Cyprian, 621, 622. *Nor by* Origin, *nor St.* Jerome, 622, 623. *Nor by St.* Basil, 623, 624. *Nor by* Boethius, Theodoret, *or* Gregory Nyssen, 624. *Nor lastly by St.* Augustin, *St.* Cyril, *or St.* Chrysostom, 624, 625. *A groundless Fiction*, V. 71. *That takes away the Care of Good Life*, ibid. *How endeavoured to be proved*, 96. VI. 567, 568, 569, 570, 591

Puritans, *who*, VI. 32. *Wrote against those who made a Separation from the Church*, II. 483, 484. *The State of their Controversy with the Separatists*, 484——492

Putrefaction, *no probable Cause of the Generation of Animals*, II. 20, 21, 22, 23

Pythagoras, *had in great Reputation*, II. 55. *His Notion of God, and his Worship*, 56, 57. *His Death*, 57

Q.

QUakers. II. 214. VI. 166

R.

RAbanus Maurus, *concerning the Real Presence in the Eucharist*, VI. 20

Rabbins, *what sort of Historians*, I. 32, 33

Raccovian *Catechism, by whom first framed*, III. 228. *Its Doctrine concerning our Saviour's Resurrection*. 228, 229. *How altered in this Point*, 229, 232

Ratramnus. *See* Bertram.

Real *Presence of Christ's Body in the Eucharist. See* Eucharist.

Reason *to be judge concerning Divine Revelation*, V. p p. 32. *How to be understood*, III. 502, 503. *Its Light but weak and dim*, II. 60. *And so owned by Mr.* Lock, III. 532, 533. *Decreed by the* Romanists. IV. 3. *Its Usefulness in Matters of Religion*, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174. VI. 593, 594. *See* Judgment of Discretion. *It directs to a first and eternal Cause of all things*, II. 60, 61. *Of Certainty in it. See* Certainty, *and* Ideas.

Rebaptization, IV. 160, 161, 238, 239

Rebellion *countenanced by the Church of* Rome, V. 133, 134

Recognitions *about Idolatry, by what Authority*, V. p p p. 31

Reconciliation. *See* Sufferings.

Redemption, *what*, III. 304

Reformation. *See* Church. *Justified*, IV. 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 462, 463. VI. 659, 660, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 717, 718, 719, 720. *The first occasions of it*, VI. 38, 39. *Opposed by the* Romanists,

IV. 359, 369, 370. *How brought about,* VI. 39. *Not neceſſary to have been deferred till a Council ſhould be convened,* IV. 361, 362
Reformation *of the Church of* England, IV. 364, 365, 366. VI. 40, 743, 744. *See* Church *of* England. *Juſtified, as to* Henry VIIIths. *Luſt.* VI. 745, 746, 747, 748, 749. *As to the Charge of Schiſm,* 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711. *As to Hereſy,* 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724. *As to its own Authority,* 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 930. *As to the Validity of its Arguments for Reforming,* 736, 737. *As to its Independency on the Power of the Civil Magiſtrate, for its Divine Right,* 737. *The Charge of Sacriledge, and the Reſult of it conſidered,* 750
Regale, III. 784, 786
Relicks *of Saints, whether to be worſhipped,* VI. 533, 534, 535
Religion *impreſſed upon the Minds of Men of all Ages,* II. 1, 2, 60, 61, 68 — 79. *How different from Superſtition,* 63. *An Inſtance of great Reaſon and Wiſdom,* 64. *Its general Foundations,* I. 227, 228, 229. *No Invention of Polititians and Prieſts,* 2, &c. Plato's *Opinion of it,* 49. *How far* Ariſtotle *agreed with him herein,* 49, 50. *Aſſerted by Perſons of the greateſt Reputation for Wiſdom and Knowledge,* 59, 60. *The* Romiſh *Religion, why not to be tolerated,* V. ppp. 753, 754, 755, 756
Remiſſion. *See* Sufferings.
Reordination *by Pope* Lucius, IIId. VI. 45. *And by others,* 46
Repentance, *what,* V. 69. *No Man can be ſaved without it,* ibid. *How God ſaid to Repent,* I. 121, 122. *Some hindrances of a timely Repentance in the Church of* Rome, VI. 574
*Reproof, too commonly ill taken,* III. 621
Reſidence, *required of the Clergy,* III. 625, 626, 670, 671, 672, 673
Reſignation *of a Benefice, to whom to be made,* III. 731, *Corrupt Reſignations not allowable,* 718. *Bonds of Reſignation deſerve our ſerious Conſideration,* 713, 714, 716, 717. *The Intereſt of our Religion, as well as of the Parochial Clergy, endangered by them,* 715. *Whether they be againſt Law,* 717, 718. *Whether Simoniacal,* 719, 720, 721. *They deprive Men without a Hearing,* 728. *And againſt all Law and Reaſon,* 729. *Precedents in favour of them enquired into,* 734, 735. *Some Queries in relation to them anſwered,* 735, 736, 737, 738
Reſurrection *of the ſame Body,* III. 571, 572, 573, 574
Revelation, *made by God is always certain,* I. 145. *And accordingly to be believed,* 146, 147. *The Abſurdities of the contrary Doctrine,* 147, 148, 149, 150
Revelations. *See St.* Brigit, *St.* Catharine, &c. *Private Revelations pleaded in the Church of* Rome *for Matters of Doctrine,* V. 92. *Revelations to* Norbertus, *St.* Gertrude, *and others,* 93, 94. ppp. 612, 613, 614, 615. *Revelations contrary to each other,* 95. *The Abſurdity and Folly of ſuch Revelations,* 96. *Revelations ſtill owned by them,* 98. *And made the Ground of Faith,* pp. 125, 126. *Of immediate Aſſent to the Divine Revelation,* 128, 129
Revenge, *aſſerted by* Crellius, *not to be ſinful in its own Nature, but only as forbidden to Chriſtians,* III. 252. *This Aſſertion diſproved,* 252, 253
Revolter, *worſe than a* Papiſt *by Education,* V. 209, 210
Rewards *and Puniſhments the great Sinews of Religion,* I. 297
Richard *Duke of* York *ſwears Allegiance to* Henry VIth. III. 949, 950. *Yet his Right, as is declared, could not be defeated.* ibid.
Right, *what,* II. 157, 158, 160. *A poſitive Inſtitution neceſſary to create a Divine Right,* 162. *And to make it unalterable, it muſt be known to come from God, with an Intention to oblige all Beleivers to the World's end,* 163, 164, 165. *How it is to be known, when poſitive Laws bind immutably,* 165, 166, 167, 168
Right *of Conqueſt,* III. 974, 975, 976
Rights *of Nations,* III. 969
Riolanus's *pretended Miracle,* V. pp. 261
Roman *Empire looked on as Univerſal,* IV. 408, 409
Roman *Province in* Britain, *how bounded,* III. 151. *Their Progreſs here,* 152
Roman *Ways here in* Britain, III. 905.
*Old* Romans, *what they Worſhipped for Deities,* V. ppp. 409
Romaniſts *chief Artifice to perſwade the World, that Proteſtants have no certain ground of Faith,* VI. 195. *Acted more by Fancy than Proteſtants,* 653, 696, 704. *Their's a leſs ſafe way to Salvation,* IV. 586 — 597
Rome, *Heathen, worſhipped their Gods without Images for* 170 *Years, till their new* Capitol *was erected,* V. ppp. 12
Rome *not the Catholick* Jeruſalem, IV. 353. *Students there, how regulated,* III. 130, 131
*Church of* Rome. *See* Church.
Romoaldus's *Ignorance, Ridiculouſneſs, Viſions,* &c. V. 102, 103. *Ill treated by the Monks, and why,* ppp. 651
Romulus's *Prayer, and Vow to* Jove, V. ppp. 17
*St.* Roſa, VI. 527

Rubrick *at the end of the Communion Service supported*, VI. 15, 16, 17, 19——25
Ruffinus's *Vindication of the 6th Canon of the Council of* Nice, IV. 426, 427, 428, 429, 430
Rule *of Faith*, VI. 439. *See* Scriptures. *A Rational, not a Mechanical Rule*, 379, 380. *Though certain in it self, yet liable to be misapplied*, 380, 381, 386, 387. *And that whereby we are bound to believe, as to Divine Revelations*, 401. *Whether compleat from the Beginning, and whilst the Canon of Scripture was not yet perfected*, 408, 409. *Whether that can be an Intellectual Rule, which Men may deviate from*, 400, 401
Rupertus Tuitiensis, VI. 22
Rutupia, *i. e.* Sandwich, III. 904

S.

SAcrament, *what used to signifie in the ancient Church*, VI. 424, 425
Sacraments. *See* Baptism, Eucharist, Kneeling. *The End and Use of them*, II. 257. *The Efficacy of them*, V. 77, 78, 79. *How they confer Grace*, II. 631, 632. *Council of* Trent *defines them to be Seven*, VI. 474. *But has no Universal Tradition for it*, 474, 475, 476. *The Sense of the* Greek *Church in this Point*, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492. *And of the Eastern Churches*, 492, 493. *How the Number of the Seven Sacraments came into the Church*, 493, 494, 495, 496
Sacrifices. *See* Mass. *Whether by the Light of Nature, or an Express Command of God*, II. 177, 178. Abel's *Sacrifice, whence more acceptable than* Cain's, 178. *Sacrifices offered by the* Jews, *by way of Atonement to God's Justice*, III. 232, 233. *The true Nature of an Expiatory Sacrifice*, 233. *This exactly agrees to our Blessed Saviour's Oblation of himself in our stead*, 233, 234. *Nor is our Saviour's Oblation of himself for us any Breach in the Measures of God's Punitive Justice*, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240. *Expiatory Sacrifices had three things especially considerable in them*, III. 296. *And all these were fulfilled in our Blessed Saviour. For He was substituted in our stead*, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305. *He made an Oblation of himself to God*, 306——324. *And he made Expiation for our Sins*, 325, &c. *Expiatory Sacrifices before the Law were all Burnt-Offerings*, 313. *Divers sorts of Sacrifices amongst the* Jews, 313, 314. *Those on the Great Day of Atonement*, 315, 318
Sacrifice *to be offered only to God*, VI. 160, 173, 174. *And for his own Honour*, 175, 176
Sacrifice *sometimes used for the Common Service of the Church*, III. 141. *Sometimes for the Holy Eucharist*, VI. 176, 179, 182. *Sometimes for solemn Commemorations*, IV. 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579. *See* Oblations.
Sacrifice *of Christ upon the Cross. See* Satisfaction *and* Sufferings.
Safe-Conducts *granted by the* Romanists, IV. 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342
Saints. *See* Prayer. *Not to be worshipped*, VI. 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 150, 151, 156, 157, 158, 161, 162. *They ought to be honoured, and why*, V. p p p. 376. *How this Honour may be called Religious*, ibid.
Salick *Laws*, III. 192
Salvation. *What things necessary to be believed in order to it*, IV. 48, 49, 50, 51. *Whether any thing which was not from the Beginning necessary to Salvation, can be made so afterwards*, 58, 59, 60, 62. *Of the Salvability of* Papists. *See* Sanderson.
Samij, *what they worshipped for a Deity*, V. p p p. 409
Samosatenus. *See* Paulus.
Sampson, *Archbishop of* Caerleon, III. 205
Sampson, *Archbishop of* York, III. 205. *Went over to* Dole *in* Bretagne, (*as the other also is said to have done*) ibid. *The long Suit that followed hereupon in the Court at* Rome, 220
Sanchoniathon, I. 17, 18, 19
*Bishop* Sanderson's *Judgment concerning the Salvation of* Papists, VI. 51, 52
Sanhedrin, II. 308, 309
Sardica. *See* Councils.
Satisfaction *of Christ*, II. 168. *See* Sufferings. *The Design and Manner of Proceeding in the Discourse concerning Christ's Satisfaction*, III. 227. *The first Rise and Subsequent Progress of this Controversy*, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240. *Christ's Satisfaction not such as to exclude the Necessity of Faith and Repentance in order to Salvation*, 245. *Nor his Punishment the very same which the Law required*, 245, 246. *To clear this, the Difference between Debts and Punishments to be considered*, 246, 247. *The Design of this Satisfaction*, 257, 258. *The Freeness of Grace asserted in Scripture destroys not the Doctrine of Satisfaction*, 345, 346
Satisfactions, *as taught in the Church of* Rome, VI. 547, 587
Saturn, *the same with* Noah, I. 366, 369, 370. *Or with* Adam, 369
Saxons. *See* East, Northern, *and* West. *Derive themselves from* Alexander's Macedonian *Army*, III. 173, 174. *Sent for hither by the* Britains, 189, 198, 199. *How*

*How they behaved themſelves not long before*, 189, 190. *Who they were*, 190. *Whence ſo called*, 190, 191. *What Places they poſſeſſed*, 191, 192. Ubbo Emmius's *Account of them*, 192, 193. *What others ſay of them*, 194. *What* Olaus Rudbeck, 195. *What* Bede, ibid. *What ſeems moſt probable concerning them*, 196. *What* Reiſnerus Reneccius *writes of them*, ibid. *The time of their coming into* Britain, 196, 197. V. p p p. 670. *A Speech made to them at their coming hither*, III. 199. *They came as mercenary Soldiers upon Promiſe of Pay*, ibid. *And did ſome Service at the firſt*, 199, 200. *The beginning of the War between them and the* Britains, 200, 201. *How the* Saxons *behaved themſelves in it*, 202, 203. *Their Succeſs*, 203. *Their Landing with new Forces under* Cerdic, *and beating the* Britains, 207. *Their Idolatries*, V. p p p. 333. *When the* Engliſh Saxons *became Chriſtians*, 671

*The* Scape-goat *believed to have been ſlain*, III. 264, 265, 266. *Denoted rather the Effect of the Expiation, than the manner of obtaining it*, 266

Scepticiſm, VI. 378

Schiſm. *See* Separation. *What it is*, II. 220, 225, 227, 454, 501, 502, 550. IV. 281. *Two-fold; Factious*, VI. 679. *Sacrilegious*, 680. *The Nature of it*, II. 222. *The Miſchief of it*, 221. *The Guilt of it*, 453, 563, 564. *Condemned by* Dionyſius *of* Alexandria, 556. *And by St.* Cyprian, ibid. *On which ſide the Schiſm betwixt us and the Church of* Rome *lies*, IV. 281, *&c.* 314, *&c.* 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 345, 346. *What Schiſms in the* Roman *Church*, V. 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154

Schools *of the Prophets. See* Prophets. *Of Learning*, I. 29, 30. III. 126, 128, 129

Schotinus's *Miracles*, V. p p. 212

Scotland, *in what Senſe called by* Bede *a tranſmarine Nation*, III. 177

Scottiſh *Antiquaries*, III. 155. Fordon's *Account of* Scotland, 155, 156, 157. Jo. Major *confeſſes the* Scots *were derived from the* Iriſh, *and that theſe came firſt from* Spain, 157. Hector Boethius's *Relation of them*, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162. Hector's *Authority enquired into*, 162, 163, 164, 165. *The* Scottiſh *Antiquities very uncertain*, 165. *The true Original of theſe fabulous Relations*, 172, 173. *How the* Scottiſh *Antiquities and the* Iriſh *agree*, 174, 175. *What their Antiquaries plead from the length of the time they have inhabited* Scotland, 175, 176, 177, 178. Gildas *takes notice of no other* Scots, *who came out of* Ireland, *but what returned back*, 187, 188

*D.* Scotus's *Opinion of the Neceſſity of believing all the Church's Definitions*, IV. [redacted], 72, 73, 74

Scotus Erigena's *Opinion concerning the Holy Euchariſt*, VI. 19, 21

Scriptures *not falſified*, I. 216, 217, 218. *No certain Credibility in thoſe Hiſtories that ſeem to contradict them*, 10. *Verſion of the* LXXII. 30, 31. *Scripture-Hiſtory credible and certain*, 66, *&c. The Uſefulneſs of it*, 66, 67, 68. *The Excellency of the Scriptures*, 374, *&c. Scriptures the only certain Guide to Salvation*, 375, 376. *Containing in them matters of the greateſt Importance*, 377, 378, 379, 380. *Giving the trueſt Repreſentation of the State of Man's Soul*, 380. *Diſcovering the only way of pleaſing God, and enjoying his Favour*, 381. *And things of the greateſt Depth and Myſteriouſneſs*, ibid. *And of the moſt univerſal Satisfaction to the Minds of Men*, 381, 382. *And this in a clear and perſpicuous manner*, 382. *With Power and Authority*, 382, 383. *Purely and ſincerely*, 383. *Uniformly and agreeably*, 383, 384. *Perſuaſively and convincingly*, 384. *Enjoining ſuch Duties as are moſt becoming God to require*, 385. *And moſt reaſonable for us to perform*, ibid. *And offering abundant Encouragement to the Obſervance of them*, 385, 386. *They contain in them the Covenant of Grace*, 386. *Yet decried by the* Romaniſts, *in order to the Belief of their Church's Infallibility*, IV. 3. *Who diſcourage the reading them*, V. 82, 83. *Nevertheleſs they declare to us the unqueſtionable Will of God*, ibid. *The Practice of the* Romaniſts *herein directly contrary to that of the Primitive Chriſtians*, 87, 88, 89. *The miſinterpreting of Scripture does not hinder its being the the Rule of Faith*, 183, 184, 185. *Of the Senſe of the Scripture*, p p. 70, 71. *The way uſed in the Primitive Church, for finding out the true Senſe of Scripture*, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78. *Difficulties in Chronology, Uſages, Phraſeology*, &c. *no Arguments againſt the Truth of Scripture*, II. 120. *The Teſtimony of matters of Fact in behalf of the Scriptures*, 122, 123, 124, 125. *And theſe related by ſuch as were no way qualified to impoſe upon the World*, 125, 126, 127. *And whoſe Doctrine was no way ſuited to the corrupt Inclinations of Mankind*, 127, 128. *Who appealed to our Saviour's Reſurrection from the Dead, and to Witneſſes of it then living, for the Proof of their Doctrine*, 128, 129. *And no manner of Inconſiſtency with themſelves, or the Hiſtory of their Times, could ever be proved upon them*, 129, 130. *But they have the concurrent Teſtimony of* Jews *and* Heathens, *for good part of*

*of what they taught*, 130, 131. *They taught nothing unbecoming a Divine Revelation*, 131. *Nor did they seek to conceal their own Infirmities*, ibid. *They gave greater Evidence of their Sincerity, than ever was given to any other Matter of Fact in the World*, 132. *They testified nothing but what themselves had seen*, 132, 133. *And presently after it was done*, 133. *Hundreds concurring in the same Testimony*, ibid *They exposed themselves to the utmost Hazards, rather than retract what they had testified*, 133, 134. *And had likewise the Assistance of a Divine Testimony, in the miraculous Gifts and Operations of the* Holy-Ghost, 134, 135. *Objections against the* Old Testament *answered*, 135 — 145. *And others against the* New, 145, 146. *The right method of Interpreting the* New Testament, III. 659, 660

Scriptures. *See* Judge of Controversies. *Shamefully blasphemed by* T. C. IV. 215, 221, 223. *How known to be the Word of God*, 107, 157, 158, 165 — 174, 201, 202, 215, 216, 273, 274, 276. *The pretended infallible Authority of the Church of* Rome, *not sufficient Evidence in the Case*, 108, 177 — 191, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209. *As appears upon* 3 *Accounts*, 107, 108. *Because an Assent is here required, beyond all Proportion, or Degree of Evidence*, 109. *Because this is to run into the same Absurdities, that should be avoided by it*, 110, 111. *And because this, instead of Resolving Faith, Undermines it*, 111, 112. *As it doth by making that necessary to Faith, which was not looked on as such, when the Doctrine of the Gospel was revealed*, 112, 113. *By destroying all the Rational Evidence of Christian Religion*, 113, 114, 115, 116. *By giving no satisfactory account of this pretended Infallibility*, 116. *Either as to the Church supposed Infallible*, 116, 117. *Or the proper Subject of this Infallibility in the Church*, 117, 118. *Or the kind of Infallibility pleaded for*, 118, 119. *Or how we may know when the Church decides Infallibly, and when not*, 119, 120, 121, 122. *Difficulties about Scripture, less than about an Infallible Church*, VI. 734, 735, 736. *Scripture, how valued by the* Romanists, 144, 145. *How by the Ancient Christians*, 204, 205. *Canon of it, how settled*, 166, 167, 168, 182. VI. 192, 194, 409, 712. *Knowledge of it possible to be learnt by the Ear only*, 180, 181, 185, 186. *The true grounds of Scripture belief*, 185, 186, 187, 188, 191, 192, 193. *Scripture the only Foundation of our Faith*, 188, 189. VI. 439 — 450, 691. *Not necessary, in order to the belief of Scripture, to enquire which is the Church*, IV. 214. *What that Church is, upon whose Testimony we receive, and believe the Scripture to contain all things necessary to Salvation*, VI. 196, 197, 198, 199. *And what its Testimony*, 732. *Scriptures come down to us by the Testimony of all Christian Churches*, 404. *Of pretended Corruptions in them*, 404, 405. *The vanity of such Pretences*, 405, 406

Scripture's *Divine Light*, IV. 218, 224. *This will not prove the Scriptures to be from God*, 218, 219. *But the Book being once owned, it proves the Divinity of their Doctrine*, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223. *Scriptures far exceed all other Writings*, 221, 222. *Contain all the Articles of our Faith*, VI. 194, 195, 196, 712. *As is owned by the* Romanists *themselves*, 401, 402. *Every one must look upon Scripture as the Rule of Faith*, 199, 200, 373, 374, 388, 390, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 439, 440, &c. 552, 588, 589. *What Judgment of the meaning of Scripture is left to private Persons*, 200, 201, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 552, 645, 646, 650, 651, 743. *See* Spirit. *The right method of Interpreting Scripture*, 388, 389, 390, 696, 697. *Scriptures teach all things necessary to Salvation plainly and intelligibly*, 402. *The Sense of them may certainly be understood, though some have misinterpreted them*, 738, 739. *And they are far less liable to Corruptions, than unwritten Traditions*, IV. 241, 242. VI. 712. *What Evidence the Church of* England *has, that she follows the Sense of it*, VI. 739

Scriptures, *whether to be had in the Vulgar Language*, VI. 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466. *Or to be with-held from the generality of Christians*, 548, 549, 587, 588. *The Doctrine of the* Romanists *in this respect*, 511, 512, 513. *The Sense of the* Gallican *Churches to this matter*, 513. *The* Romanists *have gone off from the Catholick Tradition*, 513, 514. *Whether the present* Roman *Church be the only sure Interpreter of Scripture*, 553, 554, 589. *Scripture to be relied upon in relation to things above our Capacity*, 592, 593, 594. *May be understood Literally where there is reason, and yet Figuratively at other times, where there is reason for such an Interpretation*, 617. *The proper means of ending Controversies*, 690, 691, 692, 693, 695. *Objections against this answered*, 694, 695, 696, 697, 702, 703, 704, 705. *Scripture preserved entire*, 407, 408, 409. *Till corrupted by the Council of* Trent, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456. *By what steps the* Apocrypha *got into it*, 456, 457, 458

Scythians, *their Deity*, V. p p p. 409

Seals *pendent, when first used*, III. 13

Seculum Spiritus Sancti, *first broached by the* Mendicant *Fryars*, II. 255. *Their vain Boasts of it*, 256. *Its Unreasonableness*, 256, 257
A Seducer, *how distinguished by the* Jews *from a false Prophet*, I. 103.
Cair Segent, III. 909
Cair Sejont, III. 913
Semi-pelagianism *got into* Gaul, III. 119 *Through mistake of St.* Augustin's *Doctrine*, 124, 125
Sense. *See* Testimony. *The Testimony of Sense disallowed of in the Church of* Rome *in Matters of Faith*, IV. 2, 3.
Separation. *See* Schism. *Of Protestants, not from the Catholick Church*, IV. 346, 347, 348, 440. *When it may be without Sin*, II. 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 232. V. p p p. 409, 564, 565. *From the Church of* England, II. 548, 549. *The great Mischief of it*, 549, &c. *It brings a great Prejudice upon the Cause of the Reformation*, 549, 550, 551, 552. *It is condemned by* Calvin, 550. *By* Daille, 551. *By* Amyraldus, 551, 554. *By* Claude, Paijon *and* Turretine, 551, 552. *By* Le Blanc, 552. *By* Zanchy, 553, 554. *By* Crocius, 553. *By the* Helvetian *Churches*, ibid. *By* Beza, 480. *And others*, 481. *Is a great Obstruction to Unity among Protestant Churches*, 552, 553, 554, 555. *Will justifie such Schisms, as the Christian Church has always condemned*, 555, 556, 557. *Will make Separation endless*, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562. *The Principles of it insufficient for its Vindication*, 559, 560, 635, 636, 637, 646, 647. *Argued against from Mr.* Baxter's *Principle*, 560, 561. *And from the Obligation that lies upon all Christians, to preserve the Peace and Unity of the Church*, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566. *Disallowed of in* New-England, 602, 603. *No Parity of Reason for the Dissenters separating from us, and our separating from the Church of* Rome, 647, 648, 649. *Of our Separation from the Church of* Rome, II. 225, 226, 227, 229, 462. *Of the Dissenters from the Church of* England, 462, 463. *The Unlawfulness of it*, 463. *What it is*, 471. *Its Progress*, 481, 482. *And how begun*, 479. *The Grounds of Separation now the same as at the time of the Reformation*, 471, 513. *Yet then not thought sufficient to make a Breach*, 471, 472, 473. *No Reason for it on account of our Churches Doctrine*, 512
Serapis *thought to be* Joseph, I. 372. *The same with* Jupiter Ammon, Jupiter Pharius, *and* Jupiter rerum omnium potens, V. p p p. 539
*Mr.* Serjeant's *manner of writing Controversies*, IV. 626, 627, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648 *He undertakes to hold Mr.* Godden's *Cards for him*, VI. 361, 362. *His Unfitness for such an Undertaking*, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370. *His heavy Charge upon his Answerer*, 395, 396
Sermon *of the* Mischief of Separation, *why Preached*, II. 451. *How blamed as unseasonable*, 452, 453. *And as too sharp and severe*, 453, 454. *Sermon at St.* Lawrence Jewry, *on* 1 Tim. i. 15. III. 346, &c.
Sermons. *See* Preaching.
Serpent, *that seduced our first Parents*, I. 322, 323, 324
Sigebert, *King of the* West Saxons *deposed*, III. 943
Sign, *what the* Jews *required of our Saviour*, I. 162
Silures, *from* Spain, III. 153
Simony, *what at Common-Law*, III. 719. *The Nature of it, how to be determined*, 714. *How to judge what is Simonaical*, 719, 720. *The Oath against it*, 721, 722, 723
Sinecures, III. 732
Sinners, *in what Sense said to be saved by Christ*, III. 346, 347. *How to judge of this Sense*, 348, 349, 358, 359, 360
Sins *considered as Debts*, III. 246, 247, 248, 390, 391, 392
Sixtus I. *See* Decretal Epistles.
Sixtus V. *Simonaically chosen Pope*, IV. 121
Slavery. *A state of it*, III. 940
Society. *Man a Sociable Creature*, II. 205, 206. *Duties owing upon this account*, 98, 175. *All Civil Societies said to be founded upon Consent and Compact*, 237, 238
Socinianism *utterly disowned by* Grotius, III. 271
Socinians. *See* Unitarians. *State of the* Socinian *Controversie explained*, III. 400. *These Mens manner of Writing*, III. 557, 558, 559, 560, 562
Socinus *disputes for the Impossibility of Christ's paying the very same that we were to have paid*, III. 245
Socrates's *manner of Conversation*, II. 44. *Whence he was so severely persecuted at* Athens, 44, 45, 46. *And how*, 48
Soul's *supposed Pre-existence*, I. 319. *Its Immateriality proved*, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264. *Owned by* Cicero, III. 536, 537. *And* Virgil, 537, 538. *Not necessary to be believed according to Mr.* Lock, 535. *Its Degeneracy since its Creation*, I. 318, 319, 320. *Its Immortality*, II. 10, 60. III. 533, 537, 538
Species, *how understood in the Church of* Rome, VI. 436, 437
Sphinx, *an Idol forbidden in the 2d Commandment*, V. p p p. 511
Spinoza *confuted*, II. 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98
Spirits. *The Notion of them does not imply a Contradiction*, II. 64, 65. *Of resolving Faith by a Private Spirit*, IV. 213, 214,

VI. 694, 695, 696, 697, 702, 703, 714, 715, 724, 725
Spiritual *Courts.* *See* Courts.
Sponsors *in Baptism*, II. 642, 643, 644, 645
Starchamber-Court *taken away*, III. 766, 767
Statute, De Hæretico comburendo, III. 782. *And Stat.* 11. Henry VIIth. III. 951
Stella *no friend to* Popish *Miracles*, V. p p. 234
*King* Stephen's *Intrusion into the Throne*, III. 947. V. p p p. 709
Stercoranism, *what*, VI. 21, 22
Stigand, *Archbishop of* Canterbury, *deposed*, III. 775, 776
Stilicho, *when killed*, III. 184. *He took care of the Supplies of the* Britains, *against the* Scots *and* Picts, 184
*Dr.* Stillingfleet, *how treated by his Opponents*, VI. 5. *Does not make charging the* Papists *with Idolatry, a distinctive Mark of* Puritanism, 33. *Distinguishes between Parts of Worship, and the meer Circumstances of them*, 34. *Charged with a Design of subverting the Authority of the Church of* England, 48, 49. *Vindicated as to his* Irenicum, 49, 50. *Shews in what Sense the* Gates of Hell *shall not prevail against the Church of God*, 52, 53. *No Patron of the Cause of the Separated Congregations*, 56, 57. *His Method of proving the Idolatry of the Church of* Rome, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85. *Distinguishes between the Regard due to Holy Places and Utensils, and the Worship of Images*, 94, 95. *Does not misrepresent* Trigautius's *Meaning*, 149, 150, 151. *Complains of* T. G's *unfair Boastings after the Conference at the Deanry*, 183, 203, 205. *Gives an account of the occasion of his 2d Letter to him*, 186. *Vindicates himself against Mr.* M. 187, 188, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207. *And thence argues against the Certainty of Oral Tradition*, 187. *How charged by Mr.* Serjeant, 395, 396. *Misrepresented by Mr.* Cressy, *as of different Principles from those of the Church of* England, V. p p p. 585. *And wherin*, 586
Stonehenge, III. 205
Strangled, *whether lawful to be eaten*, II. 167
Students *at* Rome. *See* Rome.
Suarez's *his Judgment about a Dispensing Power*, III. 788, 789
Subjection *to Authority*, II. 175, 176
Substance, III. 504, 505, 506, 507, 508. *The same with Body according to* Hobbes, 535, 536. *Ridiculed, and the Notion of it exposed by* Lock, 523, 524. *Yet the Being of it as certain, as that any thing is in the World*, 524. *Though not from any Simple* Ideas *of it*, 525, 526, 527, 528. *The* Idea *of Substance endeavoured to be justified from the Etymology of the Word*, 528, 529, 530. *Spiritual Substances*, 533. *Hard to be proved upon Mr.* Lock's *Principles*, 534, 535
Suburbicary *Provinces*, II. 391. Suburbicary *Churches*, III. 71, 72. IV. 426, 427, 428, 429, 430
Sueonis, *who*, III. 154
Sufferings, *and Death of* Christ, *whether to be considered as a Punishment for Sin, or a meer Act of Dominion*, III. 261, 262, 263, 400. *Mr.* Baxter's *Notion of them*, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407. *Proved to be a Punishment, from Scripture*, 263, &c. *Where he is said to bear our Sins*, 263 — 276. *And to be made Sin and a Curse for us*, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280. *And that he Died, Suffered, gave Himself, and offered a Sacrifice for our Sins*, 280, 281. *This Doctrine lays no Charge of Injustice upon God*, 282, 283, 284. Crellius's *Arguments to prove it does, considered*, 284, &c. *The Death of Christ an Expiatory Sacrifice for the Sins of Mankind*, 295, 296, &c. *As appears from his being said to die for us*, 301, 302, 303. *And to be a Ransom for us*, 303, 304, 305. *From the Oblation of it to God for that end*, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311. *From the Scripture declaring it to be an Offering and Sacrifice to God*, 311, 312. *From the nature of an expiatory Sacrifice*, 313, 314, 315, 316. *From those places in Scripture, where Christ is said to offer up himself once to God*, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321. Christ's *Entrance into Heaven could not be the Oblation of himself offered*, 321, 322. *His Exercise of Power in Heaven in no sence an Oblation to God*, 322. Crellius's *Sense repugnant to the Circumstances of the Places*, 322, 323. *Other Objections answered*, 323, 324. *The Effects of a proper Sacrifice for Sin attributed to our Savour's Sufferings*, 325. *Namely Remission of Sins*, 325, &c. *And Atonement made by his Death*, 339, 340, 341, 342. *And Reconciliation*, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346. *In what Sense Remission of Sins is attributed in Scripture to the Sacrifice of Christ*, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339
Sulpicius Severus *charged with* Pelagianism, III. 116, 117
Sun, *worshipped as Christ*, V. 52
Superstition, II. 63. *Superstitious Observations in the Church of* Rome, V. 185
Supremacy *of the Pope.* *See* Pope not Head of the Church.
Supremacy *Ecclesiastical, Restored by the Reformation*, III. 964. *The occasion of the Discourse concerning it*, 762, 763. *State of the*

*the Queſtion concerning it*, 763, 764. *The King's Supremacy by Common Law enquired into*, 768, 769. Edward *the Confeſſor's Claim in this reſpect*, 772, 774. *What the ancient Law was in this Point*, 769, 770, 771, 806. *The Notion of the Supremacy, as received in the Church of* England, *cleared*, 772, 773, 774. *Precedents in relation to it conſidered*, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782. *Alterations made about it in the time of* Henry VIIIth. 804, 807, 808. *An Objection anſwered*, 808, 809

Supremacy *of the Civil Power*, IV. 453, 454, 455. *How ſettled here upon the Reformation*, VI. 749, 750

Symmachus III. 441

Synagogues, II. 305. *The Number of them*, 306, 307. *How their Government was modelled*, 308. *The manner of reading the Law in them*, 306. *The Publick Service of God performed in them*, 310. *The manner of ſitting in them*, 311, 312

Synods. *Of the Magiſtrate's Power as to their Decrees and Canons*, II. 237. *Of whom they conſiſted*, 376, 377, 378, 387, 388, 394

Synodical *Epiſtles*. *See* Epiſtles.

Συνέδρια, III. 58, 59

T.

TAautus. *See* Thoyth.

Talmudiſts *equalled their Traditions to the Law of God, and ſometimes preferred them to it*, II. 625

Tartars, *what ſort of Idolaters*, V. p p p. 48

Tatianus. *See* Antiquity. *Converted to Chriſtianity*, IV. 259

Temples. *The Erecting theſe, and Altars, an appropriate Sign of Divine Worſhip*, V. ppp. 358, 359, 360

*Temporalities of the Biſhops and Clergy ſecured by ſeveral Acts of Parliament*, III. 809, &c.

*St.* Tereſa, V. p p.p. 594, 595, 596, 597. *St.* Paul's *Raptures parallelled by her*, ibid.

Tertullian *againſt the Heathen Idolaters*, V. p p p. 32. *His* Refrigerium *had no relation to Purgatory*, IV. 620. *Nor his* Carcer Infernus, 620, 621

Teſtimonials *for the Clergy*, III. 637

Teſtimony *of Senſe*. *See* Tranſubſtantiation. *Argued againſt becauſe* Faith is of things not ſeen, VI. 665. *Yet our Bleſſed Saviour appealed to it for the Truth of his Reſurrection*, 665, 666

Teſtimony *infallible, is the fulleſt Demonſtration of thoſe Truths, which depend on the Evidence of the things themſelves*, I. 151. *No greater Evidence of the Infallibility of a Teſtimony, than that it comes from God himſelf*, 151, 152. *How a Teſtimony may be known to come from God*, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156

Thadiocus *and* Theonus, *two Metropolitans of* London *and* York, *with many of their Clergy, withdrew into* Wales, *when their Churches were deſtroyed by the* Saxons, III. 127

Thales's *Opinion concerning God and the Creation*, II. 35, 36

Theft *in* Henry IId's *time*, III. 755

Theodoſiani, III. 423

Theodotion, III. 440, 441

Theodotus, III. 441

Theology (*natural*) *what*, VI. 85

Theſpianus's *Deity*, V. p p p. 409

Thomas. *See* Becket.

*Mr.* Thorndike's *Judgment of the Church of* Rome, VI. 28, 29, 30, 31, 61. *His Opinion concerning the Sacrifice of the Maſs*, 179

Thoyth, I. 21, 23. II. 3

Threatnings *of Judgments to come, do not ſpeak the abſolute Futurity of the Event*, I. 120, 121, 122

Thule, *what Place*, III. 153

Tiberius, *what ſort of Emperor*, III. 954, 955

Timothy *and* Titus *ſaid to be Evangeliſts rather than ſettled Biſhops*, II. 368

Tithes, II. 369. *How firſt ſettled in* Britain, III. 615. *And elſewhere*, 894. *No Argument againſt the Truth and Certainty of Religion*, 617, 618. *The Tenth of all the Lands granted to the Church by* Æthelwolfus, 771. *Inferred to be due from the much greater Proviſion made for the Tribe of* Levi *under the Law*, 645. *How they ſtand in point of Law*, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686. *Legal Diſcharges for Payment of them*, 685, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696. *Difference betwixt great and ſmall Tithes*, 690, 691

Titulus, *what, and when firſt ſettled*, II. 378, 379. III. 672, 673

Titus. *See* Timothy.

Toland's *ſmall Regard for the Scriptures*, III. 531, 532

Toledo. *The Teſtimony of the* 12*th Council there againſt Idolatry*, V. p p p. 415

Toleration, II. 179, 180. *Endeavoured by both* Papiſts *and* Diſſenters, VI. 1, 2. *Does not excuſe from the Guilt of Schiſm*, III. 631. *Who may claim the Benefit of it*, 632. Romiſh *Religion why not to be tolerated*, V. p p p. 753, 754, 755, 756. *Propounded by* Contzen, *and owned by* Coleman, *as uſeful for promoting the* Popiſh *Intereſt*, II. 446, 447. *The Danger of it*, 456, 466, 467. *Particularly as to the promoting the Deſigns of Popery*, 464, 466. *Great Complaints made of it heretofore by the*

*the* Presbyterians, 497, 498, 499
Torrid *Zone*. *See* Zone.
Toſtatus *againſt the Miracles in the* Roman *Church*, V. p p. 233
Tours. *The Second Council there againſt Idolatry*, V. p p p. 415
Traditions (*Oral*) *very uncertain*, I. 12, 67, 68. *Whether Divine or not*, IV. 201, 202, 203. *Equalled to the Law of God*, II. 625. *Apoſtolical, what*, 323, 332. *Tradition ſupplies the want of our Senſes as to what Chriſt did and ſpake*, IV. 198, 199. *And is the beſt Preparative to Faith*, 214, 215, 216. *What Evidence the Church of* Rome *produces for her unwritten Traditions*, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 411. *Whether they be of equal Authority with the holy Scriptures*, VI. 437, 454, 489, 490. *That they are not, ſhewn from the Proceedings of the Council of* Trent *itſelf*, 438, 439. *From the Divines of the* Roman *Church before that Council*, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445. *From the Canon-Law*, 445, 446, 447. *From the ancient Offices in the* Roman *Church*, 447. *And from the Teſtimony of the Fathers*, 447, 448, 449, 450. *Whether of greater Authority than the Scriptures*, IV. 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 250, 251, 252. *Its pretended Infallibility*, 600, 601. *No Security of it*, 601, 602. VI. 413, 414, 415, 416, 417. *Whether Tradition has preſerved the* Greek *Church from Error*, 184, 411, 412, 413. *Taken by ſome for the Senſe of the preſent Church*, 594. *As liable to be miſinterpreted as Scripture*, 382, 383, 484, 385. *And far more likely to fail upon divers Accounts*, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417. *Reſolves all into humane Faith*, 418. *How this new Rule of Faith came into the Church*, 450, 451, 452. *Not commonly reckoned the only Foundation of the* Roman *Infallibity*. *See* Infallibility *Nor owned as ſuch by the Council of* Trent, IV. 644. *Nor can Mr.* S. *prove that the Church of* Rome *looks upon this as the ſureſt means of their Infallibility*, IV. 630, 637. *Neither is it by any means an Infallible Guide*, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 638, 639, 640. *No certain Conveyer of the Doctrine of Chriſt*, 634, 635. *Becauſe Errors may come into the Church under the Notion of Speculations*, 635. *Becauſe ſome may miſinterpret Scripture*, 635, 636. *And becauſe others may depend upon the Definitions of their Eccleſiaſtical Governours*, 636, 637. *All are pretended to own the Infallibility of Tradition*, 644. *Mr.* Serjeant's *Demonſtration*, 648, 650, 651, 654. *Anſwered*, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657. *Manifeſt Experience an undeniable Argument againſt it*, 657, 658. *Argued againſt from Mr.* Godden's *falſe Account of the Conference at the Deanry of St.* Paul's, VI. 187. *As alſo in the Conference*, 188, 189 — 196, 201, 202. *See alſo* 372
Tranſlation *of Guilt*. *See* Guilt.
Tranſlation *of Biſhopricks*, III. 641
Tranſubſtantiation, IV. 542 — 553. VI. 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 76, 426–435, 586, 608, 654, 655. *Proved by the Appearance of a Child in the Hoſt*, V. 96. *Not of equal Authority with the Doctrines of the* Trinity *and* Incarnation, *&c.* I. 150. V. 42. *Not well conſiſtent with the ancient* Canon of the Maſs, III. 146, 147. *Deſtroys Senſe, Reaſon, Revelation*, VI. 17. Paſchaſius Radbertus *the firſt Broacher of it*, 19. Scotus Erigena *of a contrary Opinion*, ibid. Ratramnus *or* Bertram *for a Real Preſence, but no Tranſubſtantiation*, 20. *How defined by the Council of* Trent, 427, 428. *How by* Gregory *the Great*, 713. Berengarius *forced to recant what he had argued againſt it*, 429. *No Proof of it in Scripture*, 537, 618, 619, 629, 660, 661. *And is againſt Teſtimony of Senſe*, 538, 539. *And againſt Reaſon*, 539, 540, 541, 634, 635, 636. *Utterly unknown in the firſt Ages of the Church*, 595, 608 — 616. *The Arguments then brought for the Proof of our Saviour's Incarnation effectually overthrow Tranſubſtantiation*, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599. *As alſo doth what the Fathers diſcourſed concerning the natural and inſeparable Properties of Chriſt's Body*, 599, 600, 601, 602. *And the Difference they put between a Body and a Spirit*, 602, 603. *And their denying the Subſiſtence of Accidents without their Subſtance*, 603, 604. *Together with their Opinion of the Evidence of Senſe*, 604, 605, 606, 607
Treaſon, III. 755
Treaſures *of the Church of* Rome, VI. 674
Trent. *See* Councils. *Council of* Trent *declares, that Chriſtians ought to give the ſame Worſhip to the Holy Sacrament, which they give to God himſelf*, V. 45. p p p. 486, 487. *How to reconcile this with the Definition of the Council of* Nice, 488, 489
Trials, *by Juries of what ſtanding*, III. 750. *The true Original of them*, 859, 860. *Without Juries in ſome Caſes, allowed by the Common Law*, 747, 748
Trials, *by Peers, not neceſſary in all Caſes*, III. 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754
Trinity. *See* Curcellæus, Valentinus Gentilis *and* Unitarians. *This Doctrine plainly taught in Scripture*, VI. 618. *New Explications of this Doctrine to be avoided*, III. 413

413, 414. *Ill use made of them*, 414, 415. *Our Doctrines concerning it taught from the Beginning*, 432, 433. *And not introduced by Force or Interest*, 435. *No Contradiction for three Persons to be in one common Nature*, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456. VI. 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 636, 637. *Nor is this any way unreasonable*, 593, 594. Athanasius's *Doctrine concerning this great Article of our Religion*, III. 456, 457. *St.* Basil's, 457, 458, 459. Gregory Nyssen's, 459, 460. *St.* Jerome's, 461. *St.* Hilary's, ibid. *St.* Ambrose's, 462. *St.* Augustine's, ibid. Justin Martyr's, 496. Athenagoras's, 496, 497. Theophilus's *of* Antioch, 497. Clement's *of* Alexandria, ibid. *The* Jews *had a Notion of* Three Subsistences *in the* Deity, 494, 495. Papists *make absurd and horrible Representations of this Holy Mystery*, V. ppp. 406, 407. *Four sorts of Images of the Trinity*, 471, 472. *Such Images condemned by Pope* John 22d, ibid.

Trinitarians *Nominal, so called*, III. 415, 416, 417, 418. *And Real*, 418, 419, 420. *A Method of composing the Difference between them*, 420, 421, 422, 426

Trumpet. T. G's *Speaking Trumpet*, VI. 80, 81

Truth, *the most natural Perfection of our Souls*, I. 1, 3, 4. *To be diligently sought after*, 5. *Oftentimes nearly resembled by Error*, ibid. *Its Ground and Pillar*, VI. 683

Tunbert, *a Bishop, deposed*, III. 770

Turretine's *Judgment concerning Separation*, II. 551, 552

Types, *how distinguished from Symbols*, II. 257

Tyrrel *(a Priest) his Confession of a Cheat*, V. pp. 247

Tyrus, I. 18

V.

Valentinian's *Constitution for the Regulation of Students at* Rome, III. 130, 131

Valentinus Gentilis's *Doctrine concerning the* Trinity, III. 424, 425

Valesij, *whence this Sect derived*, III. 58

Vandals, *conveyed by* Bonifacius *into* Spain, III. 185

Vasquez's *Opinion concerning a Dispensing Power*, III. 789. *Some Objections of his in relation to the Second Council of* Nice *removed by* Sirmondus, V. 33. *His Opinion of Images*, ppp. 476

Verulam *sadly used by the* Britains, III. 896, 897. *Called anciently* Cair Mincip, *or* Municip, 904. *Thought to be* Cassivelaun's *Town*, 903

Vicars, III. 626, 650, 651

Vigorius's *Acknowledgment of the Sense in which the Pope was called Universal Bishop in any of the ancient Writers of the Church*, IV. 410, 411

Vincentius Ferrerius, *a Worker of Miracles*, V. pp. 219, 220

Vincentius Lerinensis's *Doctrine vindicated*, IV. 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93

*A* Vindication *of the* Guildhall-*Sermon against an Exception of Mr.* Alsop, II. 454, 455, 459, 460, 461. *And from the great Outcry that was against it*, 455, 456, 457. *And from the Author of the Christian Temper*, 461, 462. *And again, as to the Seasonableness of it*, 451, 463, 464

Virgil's *Prayers to* Jove, V. ppp. 17, 18

*Blessed* Virgin's *perpetual Virginity*, IV. 159, 160. *The Worship of her in the Church of* Rome, VI. 530, 531, 532, 533. *Her immaculate Conception*, V. 92, 93. *Prayers to her*, ppp. 379, 380. *The Worship of her unlawful and idolatrous*, 381, 382. VI. 585. *The People not well instructed in this Point*, V. ppp. 383

Viscounts *not till* Henry VIth's *time*, III. 840

Visitation *of Colleges not illegal, though it be without Appeal to Common-Law*, III. 877—885

Visitations *Episcopal, what their proper Business*, III. 620, 637, 638. *Articles of Enquiry at them*, 654

Visitatorial *Power of the King considered*, III. 804—813

Visiting *the Sick*, III. 632, 633

Unction *(Extreme) declared by the Council of* Trent *to be a true and proper Sacrament*, VI. 483, 495. *And by* Innocent Ist. 495. *But* Gregory *the Great gives a different Account of it*, 715, 716. *St.* James's *anointing in order to bodily Cures in the first place*, 484, 485, 486. *Administred by the* Greeks *to the Healthy as well as the Sick*, 492. *And to the Sick in order to the Recovery of their Health*, ibid. *And their Oil is commonly consecrated by the Presbyters*, ibid.

Union *of Parishes*, III. 673

Unitarians. *See* Trinity. *Their Doctrine concerning our Saviour's Satisfaction*, III. 227, 228, 229, 230. *The Rise of this Controversy*, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234. *The Progress of it*, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240. *Scripture, if understood in its plain literal Sense, against them*, 242, 281. *Hence they are forced to construe it metaphorically*, 242. *Thus they pervert the Scripture to a very wrong Sense*, 243. *Nor is there any thing, how clearly soever revealed in it, but may after this manner be wrested to a very different Sense from what was intended by the*

*Writer*, ibid. *And the whole Gospel may be made an Allegory*, 244. *Sometimes they pretend not to deny our Lord's Satisfaction*, 260, 261. *But really mean nothing of what the Words seem to import*, 261, 406, 407, 408. *More insuperable Difficulties in their way than in ours*, 355, 356, 357. *Why they profess themselves to deny the Doctrine of the Trinity*, 413. *The several Steps taken by their Writers in order to the Advancement of Deism*, 427, 428, 429. *Their Treatment of the Deists*, 429, 430. *They speak favourably of* Mahometans, Jews, *and* Tartars, 430, 431. *Their way of answering what is brought against them*, 433, 434, 557, 558, 559, 560, 562. *They boast of their Descent from the* Ebionites *and* Nazarens, 436, *&c. They deny not that God may oblige them to believe things above our Comprehension*, 448. *Their Charge of Contradiction considered*, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452. *The Sense of Scripture examined*, 469 —— 486. *The Form of Baptism a standing Argument against them*, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 499. *As also the Hymns and Doxologies of the ancient Church*, 492, &c. *And their Writings in defence of our Religion against Infidels*, 496, 497. *And from the first Creeds*, 500, 501, 502. *The* Unitarians *Objections against the Argument from the Form of Baptism refuted*, 498, 499, 500. *Their Objection from Reason examined*, 502. *And from Antiquity*, 558, 559, 560. *Their common Plea, that if we allow things above our Reason, we shall never know where to stop, taken into Consideration*, 519, 520

Unity *of Essence*, III. 453

*of Existence*, III. 453, 454

Unity, *wherein it consists*, II. 563. *The Obligations all Christians are under to preserve it*, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566. *Pretended to in the Church of* Rome, V. 137

Universal *Bishop. See* Pope.

Universities, *Parts of the Ecclesiastical Body*, III. 883, 884. *And have peculiar Jurisdictions*, 885

Vortigern, *a* British *King, Deposed*, III. 943

Vortimer, *where buried*, III. 201

Vossius's *Notion of the* Gentile *Idolatry*, VI. 83, 84

Vows, *an appropriate Act of Divine Worship*, V. p p p. 365, 366

Cair Urnach, III. 913

Ursula, *and her Companions*, III. 180

Usages, *different in the ancient Church*, II. 195, 196

Usurpations *of the Court of* Rome, V. p p p. 700 —— 732

Uther Pendragon, III. 207

W.

Wafers, *when first brought into use in the Church of* Rome, VI. 181

Wales. *See* Prince.

Wall, Hadrian's, *where*, III. 185. Britains, *where*, ibid. *The last, where*, ibid. Severus's, *where, and how built*, 186

St. Waltan's *Herse*, V. p p. 213

Warwick. *See* Cair Guaricon.

Washing *of Hands amongst the Pharisees*, II. 624, 625. *Why condemned by our Saviour*, 626

Water *Holy*, II. 218. VI. 579, 580

Weak *Arguments are a Prejudice to the Cause they are brought to support*, IV. 106. *As may be seen in the* Romanists *way of Arguing*, 107

*The* Weald *of* Kent *and* Sussex, III. 206. *No Monuments of Antiquity to be found there*, ibid.

Cair Went, III. 913

Westminster-Abby, *by whom built*, III. 925, 926. *Rebuilt by* Henry IIId. 926

West-Saxons, *beginning of their Kingdom*. III. 207. *That it did not extend so far as* Cornwall, 214. *Their Settlement here, and by whom*. V. p p p. 672

T. White's *Doctrine concerning the Pope's Personal Infallibility*, IV. 61, 62

Whitgift, *Archbishop of* Canterbury, VI. 25, 26, 32.

Wilfrid, V. p p p. 678, 679. *Refused Orders from the* Scots, *and* British *Bishops, and why*, 684. *Was made Archbishop of* York, *and afterwards Deposed*, 678, 679. III. 770

*King* William's *Title to the Crown*, III. 968, 969, 970, 971, 972, 973, 974, 975. *His Usage of King* James, III. 976

Will *of God may be sufficiently declared to Men by Writing*, V. 33. *The written Will of God contains all things necessary to Salvation*, ibid.

Will *of Man. St.* Augustine's *Doctrine concerning its Liberty*, III. 124

Winchester, *anciently called* Cair Guent, III. 907

Winfrid, *Bishop of the* Mercians, *deposed*, III. 770

Witnesses, III. 655

Woden, *the Chief God of the* Saxons, *formerly one of their Kings*, V. p p p. 671

Worcester, *called anciently* Cair Guiragon, *or* Guarangon, *or* Cair Wrangon, III. 910

World, *not made by chance*, II. 35. *Nor out of Pre-existent Matter*, I. 277, 278, 280, 281, II. 14, 15. *But Created by God*, I. 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270. *The Opinions of the Philosophers in this respect*, 279.

*The* Atomical Hypotheſis *of the World's Production*, 282, 283. *Proved to be precarious*, 283. *Becauſe they have no Proof of their Atoms*, 284, 285, 286. *Nor of the Motion ſuppoſed in them*, 286, 287, 288. *Nor of the Concretion of Bodies by ſuch Motion*, 288, 289, 290. *It is alſo inſufficient and unſatisfactory*, 290, 291, 292, 293. Des Cartes's Hypotheſis *of the Origin of the World conſidered*, 294, 295, 296. *World believed to be the Work of God, by the Wiſeſt and Beſt amongſt the* Heathens, II. 59. *How its Eternity came to be aſſerted*, I. 270, 271. *The falſity of the Arguments brought for it*, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277. *How Peopled till the Flood*, 333, 334, 335, 336. *How after it*, 346, &c. *Some Remainders of its ancient Hiſtory were preſerved, in the ſeveral Nations after their Diſperſion*, 360. *How theſe came to be corrupted*, 361, 365, 366, 367, 368

Worſhip. *See* Hoſt, Images, Incenſe, Nature, Prayer, Relicks, Saints, Virgin. *What*, V. ppp. 341, 342. *Diſtinguiſhed from Honour*, ibid. VI. 71, 72, 73. *God alone to be Worſhipped*, V. 68. *In all Acts of Worſhip three things to be conſidered*, p p p. 369. *Worſhip of God. See* Church-Government, Laws, *and* Nature. *The Modes and Circumſtances of it, left undetermined by the Goſpel*, II. 266, 267 *What meant by a Subſtantial Part of it*, 622, 623. *The Marks of Difference between Innocent Ceremonies, and Superſtitious Parts of Divine Worſhip*, 623, 624, 627, 628. *Divine Worſhip, what*, V. p p p. 343, 344. VI. 66, 106, 107, 619, 621. *Not to be given to a Creature*, V. 56, 57, 58, 59. ppp. 387, 388. VI. 107. *Some external Acts of Worſhip are peculiar to God*, V. p p p. 352. VI. 155, 159, 160, 161. *What they be*, 160. *How diſtinguiſhed from Acts of an Inferiour Worſhip*, 166, 167, 168. Tho. Aquinas *teaches, that the ſame Worſhip belongs to Chriſt, and to his Image*, V. p p p. 569. *Divine Publick Worſhip, what*, V. 21. *Not to be meaſured by the Intentions of Men, againſt the declared Will of God*, ibid. *The Divine Law the Rule of it*, 22. *Worſhip Religious and Civil diſtinguiſhed*, p p p. 344, 345. *How the Church of* Rome *falls ſhort of the Heathens*, 350, 351. *What thoſe Acts are which God has appropriated to himſelf*, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356. *The Senſe of the Fathers, of the Notion of Divine Worſhip*, 384, 385. *An account of the Principles of Divine Worſhip among the* Heathens, *from their own Writers*, 428, 429, 430, 431. *Worſhip of Deified Men*, 432. *In external Acts of Worſhip, the Object of Worſhip is to be conſidered*, 517. *And the local Circumſtances of expreſſing that Worſhip towards that Object*, 518

X.

XAcchius, *no Friend to* Romiſh *Miracles*, V. p p. 260, 261

Xaviere (Francis) *his Miracles*, V. p p. 234, 235

Xavier (Jerome) *framed a Goſpel of his own*, V. p p. 236, 237

Xiſuthrus, I, 366

Y.

YEars *very different among the Heathens*, I. 45, 46, 47, 48

York, *anciently the Chief Seat of the Emperor in* Britain, III. 121

Z.

ZAbij, I. 27, 28, 138

Zanchy's *Opinion concerning the Divine Right of Epiſcopacy*, II. 405, 406. *And concerning Separation on account of indifferent Ceremonys*, 553, 554

Zenobia, III. 441

Zone. *The* Torrid Zone *not only habitable but pleaſant*, II. 89, 90

FINIS.